



15/ Bird
552-1

Whitaker

5073

5

M A R Y
QUEEN OF SCOTS
VINDICATED.

By JOHN WHITAKER, B. D.
AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF MANCHESTER;
AND
RECTOR OF RUAN-LANYHORNE, CORNWALL.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

THE SECOND EDITION, ENLARGED AND CORRECTED.

V O L. I.

L O N D O N:
PRINTED FOR J. MURRAY, N^o 32, FLEET-STREET.

MDCCXC.

Y A M
O P H I O T S

V I D I C A L E D

BY JOHN WILKINSON, D.D.

A NEW SYSTEM OF MANICURE

THE NEW SYSTEM OF MANICURE

IN THREE VOLUMES

THE SECOND EDITION REVISED AND CORRECTED

BY JOHN WILKINSON, D.D.

LONDON

PRINTED BY J. JOHNSON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD

1801

THE NEW SYSTEM OF MANICURE

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

P R E F A C E.

TH E eight letters, twelve sonnets, and two marriage-contracts; which either in their subscriptions, in their composition, or in both, have been attributed to the pen of the unfortunate Mary; and on which, principally, is founded all the slander that has been raised against her; have been as singular in their fortune, as they are in their nature. Suspected for forgeries by numbers, at the time of their original appearance; and condemned equally by numbers, for certain forgeries; they gained by degrees upon the good opinion of the publick, till they nearly came at last into the full possession of it. In this kind of pre-eminence, they continued to our own days. They carried a commanding boldness, in their air and manner. And nothing imposes more readily upon the easy faith of the world, than the bold testimony of a confident witness.

The most important of these papers, however, the letters, had been very strongly encountered

at first by a *Defence of Mary's Honour*; which was published by her worthy adherent, Lesley, bishop of Ross; and which was at once lively, convincing, and pointed. But this was instantly suppressed, by the violence of Queen Elizabeth. No vindication of Mary was suffered to appear. Many were published on the continent; yet none of them durst venture upon English ground. And, at the same time, the *Detection of Mary's Doings* by Buchanan; that daring effort of fabricated calumny, in which the principal of the two contracts, all the sonnets, and all the letters were originally published; received every recommendation, that could be lent it by authority. It was presented in form to Elizabeth herself. It was circulated with industry by her ministers. In that period of our government, such artifices of tyranny would carry a peculiar efficacy with them. They could not fail of success. The reputation of Mary was assaulted on every side, in vigorous and artful appeals to the publick. She was debarred from all counter-appeals, in her own defence. From the malicious partiality of mankind to slander, the energy of a vindication is no ways equal to the force of an accusation. What then must be the

force of the one, when the other is not permitted to accompany it; when this is suppressed, and that is supported, by all the exertions of authority in the government, and by all the habits of obedience in the people? The consequence was very natural. The sonnets, contracts, and letters were received as authentick testimonies of Mary's guilt. The opinion of the publick became fixed upon the point. And a slander, that has once got possession of the general faith, is the most difficult of all prejudices to be removed.

But in 1754 a wonderful revolution began to take place, in the history of these established evidences. Mr. Goodall, keeper of the Advocates' library at Edinburgh, stepped forward with a courage, that seemed to border upon rashness; in order to prove them mere forgeries, and to disabuse the deceived publick. He was a man very conversant with records. He was, therefore, in the habit of referring assertions to authorities. He was also actuated perhaps by a spirit of party, as a party had been then formed in the nation concerning the point. Something more vigourous than the abstracted love of truth, is generally requisite to every arduous undertaking. But, whatever were his

motives, his enterprize was honourable, and his execution powerful. He entered into an examination of the papers, with considerable spirit. He went through it, with considerable address. He even proved the letters to be forgeries, in so clear a manner; that one is astonished, it had never been done before. *This* shews, indeed, the little attention which had been paid to the subject; in care to substantiate, or in zeal to destroy, the fundamental credit of the whole. And *that* forms one of those grand discoveries, which must necessarily be very rare in the history of any nation, and therefore reflect a peculiar honour, upon the individual who makes them.

Yet such was the factious credulity then prevailing generally in the island, that this work, one of the most original and convincing which ever were published, made its way very slowly among us. Even some of our first-rate writers, presumed to set themselves against it. Dr. Robertson, a disciple of the old school, wrote a formal dissertation in opposition to it. Even Mr. Hume, who in *history* had learned to think more liberally than the Doctor, still professed and defended his adherence to the ancient error, in some incidental notes to his History
of

of England. And the nation stood suspended between the authority of great names, and the prejudices of "the million," upon one side; and a new name, new arguments, and demonstration, on the other. Then Mr. Tytler arose. He generally took the same ground, which Mr. Goodall had taken before him. He generally made use of his weapons. He brightened up some. He strengthened others. With both and with his own, he drove the enemy out of the field. Dr. Robertson quitted it directly. Mr. Hume rallied, after a long interval of eleven or twelve years. He rallied with a seeming ferocity of spirit, and with a real imbecillity of exertion. He, who never replied to an adversary before, now replied to Mr. Tytler in a note to a new edition of his history. He laid himself out there, in reproaches against Mr. Tytler, and in vindications of himself. But he touched upon the cause of Mary, in a single point only. And his efforts of proving in all, were slight in their aim, and feeble in their operation. Mr. Tytler, however, very properly advanced upon him again, in a postscript to a new edition of his own work; and Mr. Hume retired finally with Dr. Robertson. Mr. Tytler deservedly gained great honour, by

the contest. His work is candid, argumentative, acute, and ingenious. Only, his success seems to have injured his master's reputation. The glory was in no small measure Mr. Goodall's own. Yet such is the capriciousness of fame conferred by men, that the laurels are still shading the brow of Mr. Tytler, while the original proprietor is almost forgotten. It is a justice due to the memories of illustrious masters, not to let their names be lost in the succeeding splendour of their scholars, when a large share of that splendour is derived from the masters themselves.

In this state of the controversy, the nation continued for many years. The new truths were gradually gaining ground. None opposed them. Numbers embraced them. And at last, in the natural progress of conviction, Dr. Stuart appeared about four years ago; with a regular history of Mary's reign, modelled upon the authority of records, and therefore vindicating the character of the Queen. He even challenged Dr. Robertson, as the preceding historian of her reign, to leave the retreat which he had kept so long, to come forward from his covert at last, and either justify or retract his slanders against her. This was fair
and

and manly. But the Doctor was too prudent to accept the challenge. He had gained his first honours in historical composition, from that very history. These indeed had withered on his head. But he might lose them entirely, in attempting to freshen them. The nation was no longer in that high state of faction, in which it stood when he published first. And to retract what he had said, could not be expected from that measure of generosity, which ordinarily falls to the share of man.

It was the perusal of Dr. Stuart's spirited and judicious History, in the second edition of it; that put me upon examining the evidences, on which the whole is founded. I had formerly read the controversy, just as thousands must necessarily have read it, with a transient attention to the cited records, and with a full conviction on the side of Mary. But I now resolved to go deeper. The result was, that I quickly saw some particulars concerning the letters, sonnets, and contracts, as I thought; which had not yet been opened with sufficient clearness, had not yet been pressed with sufficient vigour, or had been totally overlooked hitherto. These would serve, I saw, to vindicate more fully the character of a Queen, to

whom the nation owes so much in reparation, for two centuries of unremitted obloquy. And these have been so successively continued from point to point since, that they have at last, I find, embraced the whole history and evidence of the writings, within their ample circle.

Yet, in justice to my own candour, I ought to acknowledge; that, in doing this, I have found myself compelled at times to avoid the ground, which the preceding champions for Mary have generally occupied. From a prudential regard for myself, I have been careful not to take any that was untenable. From a more dignified respect for facts, I have been upon my guard against that generosity of compassion, for a highly injured woman; which is so apt to steal over the spirits, and to impose upon the judgment, of an honest man. And, while I profess myself a warm friend to Mary, I wish to be considered as a much warmer one, to the truth of history in writing, and to the exercise of integrity in life.

A D V E R-

A D V E R T I S E M E N T

T O T H E

S E C O N D E D I T I O N.

WHEN I had conducted the present Vindication laboriously through the press; every sheet of the whole having been transmitted to me in Cornwall, and corrected by me here; I did not indulge myself with repose, after all my labours. I knew the host of adversaries, that the cause of this unfortunate Queen had still to encounter. I knew that Dr. Robertson, the respectable and veteran leader of them, was still alive, in the full bloom of reputation for his other compositions, and with his old animation of zeal for the defamers of Mary. Lord Hailes, I also knew, was equally alive; and equally ready, I supposed, to produce his arguments, and to throw out his sarcasms, in assailing the character of Mary,

X A D V E R T I S E M E N T T O

Mary, under pretence of defending it. And there were numbers, I equally knew, both in England and in Scotland, but especially in the latter; who had been bred up in the bosom of political and religious prejudice against Mary, had been taught to abhor her with a wild credulity of spirit, and would not easily bear to see her placed, by mine or by any hand, triumphant on the throne of honour. Some of these, but especially Lord Hailes and Dr. Robertson, I expected to come forward in opposition to my work. I therefore prepared to receive them vigourously. I went over a part of my old ground again. I even extended my range of investigation. I thus formed a number of remarks, some corrective of the old in subordinate circumstances, some confirmatory of them in important points, many entirely new in themselves, and all uniting to serve the interests of Mary and of truth usefully. And thus to prepare for opposition in the very moments of publication, I now see, was the likeliest way to ensure success under it.

Dr. Robertson had particularly shewn me by his very recent conduct, that he still adhered to almost all his numerous errors in his
History

History of Mary. About five weeks before I published, just as the whole work was printed, and in May 1787; he sent out a new edition of his History, with some additions to it, that were principally calculated to obviate a *few* of the arguments, which had pressed hard upon the Doctor and his cause. Having preserved a strange silence for *seven and twenty* years, to the objections which Mr. Tytler had begun, and Dr. Stuart had pursued, against his History; he spoke out at last, to notice *three* of them. But he noticed not even these, till the more formidable of his two antagonists, his rival historian, and his formal challenger, had nine months before sunk in early life into the grave. Then it was, that the Doctor had confidence enough in his courage, to step out upon the stage, and to produce his counter-reasons. He accordingly replied to the strong argument, derived from the perpetual suppression of Melvill's letter by the rebels; and to the stronger, from their suppression of the famous eight letters, and from their plain declarations indeed that they had them not, for nearly *six* months after they posteriously pretended to have had them. And he replied also to the still stronger argument, from the
 violent

violent contradiction of the two records, the Act of Council and the Act of Parliament, in their respective descriptions of the letters. All this naturally claimed my attention first. I examined it all. Those two replies I had already precluded, I found, by the correspondent parts of my work; and I had only to subjoin a note to each, in order to show that I had. But this last, as being entirely new, required a distinct and formal consideration. I therefore gave it one. And I have inserted in Nos. I. and II. of the Appendix, what I think a compleat refutation of it.

Having done this, I was induced to examine a multiplicity of points more in my own work. In vol. iii. p. 38, I had asserted the copy of the treaty with the Scotch rebels in 1560, to be all a forgery. This was a bold push at the grand charter of political presbyterianism in Scotland. The boldness induced me to look over the whole, with a more comprehensive attention than I had paid it before. And the result was a large dissertation, which now forms No. XIV. of the Appendix, and brings in new evidences of the forgery additional to the old. I was then led to consider, what appeared to me as some other forgeries,
in

in the rebels of the same period; and the proofs of the point are thrown together in another dissertation, No. XV. of the Appendix. *That* confirmation of the old charge, and *this* accession of a new one, unite to corroborate all the charges before; and to show the wide and extended circle of forgery, in which the wretched fabricators of all moved.

In the midst of these enquiries, Lord Hailes favoured me with a letter; communicating some new observations of his on the sonnets, all as unfriendly to Mary in their tendency, as his former were. This obliged me to consider and answer them, just as the reader will see in a long note, now placed at the end of the sonnets. A gentleman of my own acquaintance, also; one, like Lord Hailes, professing a friendliness to Mary, and yet, like him, ready to receive some of the wildest falsehoods against her; transmitted to me his remarks on my incidental and detached account of the divorces, in vol. iii. p. 313. He thus induced me to reconsider the account with a stricter attention, to mould it into a more regular and consistent form, to enlarge it into the size in which it now appears, and to set the point at last, I hope, in the full light of historical truth.

But,

But, what is much more important than either of these, I have annexed a whole chapter to the second volume, in order to present a genuine letter of Mary's after the eight forgeries; from it, and from other authorities, to retort the charge of impurity upon Elizabeth, which she so unjustly laid upon Mary's head; and to hold up to view *all the private part* of Elizabeth's character. Meeting by accident likewise with Davison's very ample apology, for his share with Elizabeth in the murder of Mary; and seeing the murderous spirit of Elizabeth clearly delineated by it, in all its immediate advances towards that deed of horror; I have drawn up from it and from other papers, such a history of the more immediate and the more distant advances, such a narrative of a murderer's mind, stepping by slow paces towards the murder, as the world has never seen displayed yet. This I have inserted, as sect. 6 of chap. 3, in vol. i. I have also placed the apology itself, one of the most extraordinary and interesting monuments in all the reign of Elizabeth, and yet little known in its particular contents; with some necessary notes to it; in No. XVI. of the Appendix. To these I have added a large variety of lesser notices,

notices, which are to take their place in different parts of the Vindication, and combine to illustrate, to enlarge, and to secure the whole. And I have subjoined to all, that convenient appendage to every work of size, an Index.

In these additional parts, as well as in the original, I have used a quickness of language at times, by which my more *gentle* reader may be hurt in his feelings. But let the gentlest of my readers reflect, that such a manner is unavoidable, from the nature and circumstances of the controversy. All controversy is in the literary world, what all war is in the political, an evil necessarily incident to the wretchedness of our present state. In war such acts are lawful, as would be criminal out of it. Blows and wounds *then* become licensed outrages. Just so it is in controversy. A tartness of remark, a harshness of reprehension, and a provoking pointedness of triumph, are all as lawful as blows and wounds in war. War cannot subsist without these. Controversy cannot, without those. And to fight fairly without wounding, or to controvert fairly without hurting, are equally impossible. But the present controversy concerning Mary, has always
carried

carried the aggravated unkindness of a civil war with it. Indeed it cannot well be conducted without this. The enormity of the charges brought against Mary, the savageness of her first persecutors, and the effrontery of her first traducers, must naturally kindle such a spirit in her friends and in her enemies; as cannot easily, and perhaps never will entirely, be extinguished. It should be, if it can. Civil wars should be carried on, if they can be, with the moderation of national wars. But they never are, they never can be. The mind takes too strong an interest in the cause, to be kept down in the requisite state of serenity. The passions become engaged in the quarrel. And the antagonists on both sides deal about their blows, with a double portion of vigour.

Let me add also one observation more upon this subject, as a professed advocate for Mary. The publick was originally deluded into a bad opinion of this Queen, by a sophistry of argumentation and a hardness of assertion, that have no equal (I believe) in all the history of man. This hardness and this sophistry have been continued, under a gradually softened character, from the original calumniators

lumniators down to the modern defamers of her. How then is all this to be counteracted, in its long and hereditary influence upon the publick? Not by mild modes of acting, surely. Mildness will never answer the purpose. Something more powerful must be applied. And a nation, long bent to earth under the load of received falsehood, can never be effectually instigated to throw off the load, to erect its head towards heaven, and to enjoy the sun of truth shining there: till it catches fire from the warmth of some spirited writer; till it is brought by it to sneer at the elusiveness of reasoning, with which it has been hitherto cheated, and to spurn at the audacity of affirmation, with which it has been imposed upon before.

In this manner, have these new notices been drawn up; a set of auxiliary forces, as it were, ready to be brought into the field, whenever I should be called to an encounter. Yet of such an event, I now find, there is no immediate probability. I should indeed have thought myself honourably matched, by an opposition from Dr. Robertson or Lord Hailes. But his Lordship has explicitly declined the contest, in his letter to myself. The Doctor

also, I hear, is so little disposed to *refute* the Vindication, that he has declared his resolution not to *read* it. He is thus practising the arts of generalship, which many a veteran has been obliged to practise before him. WAR-BURTON particularly, when he found himself attacked by LOWTH, similarly refused to read what he feared he could not answer; and, with a child's simplicity of cunning, imagined he should escape the lightning of his adversary's wit, by shutting his eyes to the sight, and evade the thunder of his adversary's argument, by stopping his ears to the sound. Hopeless of either of these, therefore, I had resolved to give my new remarks to the public at once, in the form of a supplement to my work; when, to my surprize, I found it requisite to publish a new edition of it. I accordingly publish one, with all my corrections and additions incorporated regularly into the work; and also print them separately, for the purchasers of the first edition. I am yet ready, however, to stand forward in assertion of the cause, which I have espoused; whenever I am called upon by any writer of consequence. Such a one will not dwell upon petty points. He will either fix his footing upon the great
topicks

topicks of debate, or he will be wise enough to be silent. And for these, so long as I am convinced that Mary has had the foulest treatment, which ever poor princess had; and was concerned in her life with a set of wretches, such perhaps as the world never saw before, and such as, I trust, it will never see again; so long shall I be ready, to lay out my time, my faculties, and my spirits, in vindication of her.

R. L. PARSONAGE,
May 26th, 1788.

THE SACRAMENT

top of debate, on his will be very strong
to be silent. And let those who have been
convinced that Mary has had the same
intent, which ever from punishment had, and was
concerned in her life, with a life of suffering
such perhaps as the world never knew before.
And I think, I trust, it will never be again
long shall I be ready to lay out my life for
truth, and my heart, in the service of
her.

Wm. B. Patterson
May 20th. 1838

Wm. B. Patterson

M A R Y

QUEEN OF SCOTS

V I N D I C A T E D.

CHAPTER I.

§ I.

FROM that wonderful event in the human history, which reason could never discover, and revelation was forced to disclose; but which now appears so obvious to the former, that she wonders at her own want of assistance from the latter; a sharp edge of ill-will has been set upon the mind of man. This shews itself strongly in those petty dissensions, which are perpetually teasing the bosom of domestick happiness. But it shews itself more apparently to the general eye, in those noisier quarrels, that are continually assaulting the interest of kingdoms without, destroying the peace of them within, and filling the page of history with revolutions.

Such an evil tendency as this in the human heart, was sure to display itself very openly in that grand revolution of our own island, which, with a just triumph of spirit, we call THE REFORMATION. It would naturally have come forward in a merely civil dissension, a struggle for power, a contest for liberty, or a dispute about modes of government; in any of those oppositions of sentiment and collisions of action, which have so frequently agitated our country. But it was sure to come forward with a larger portion of vehemence, in such a contention as that. There religion united with polity, and the highest interests of Heaven combined with the dearest concerns of earth, to call out all the passions of the soul, to lend a double force to the good in them, and to give a double vigour to the bad. And, in such a situation, this infused *virus* of the heart would work, and ferment, and discharge itself, with a very extraordinary violence.

It did so, even in *our own* kingdom. But it was still more violent in SCOTLAND. From the graver cast of character perhaps, which seems to have always prevailed among the Scotch; from the greater turbulence of their nobles, certainly; from the lower state of civility among them; and, above all, from the accidental opposition of the crown to the prevailing spirit of the people; it fermented into such disorders, and discharged itself in such enormities, as the unthinking and the unprincipled are always ready to place, to the discredit of religion itself. But religion was
only

only a partial cause. Liberty was an equal one. And those strong seeds of malignity, which now seem to be naturalized to the human soil, were a much more powerful one than either.

The old turbulence of the Scottish barons, which had previously evaporated in open wars with England, in private hostilities upon the borders, in rebellions against the crown, or in family-feuds amongst themselves; now assumed another form, and moved in another direction. It appeared all at once in the cause of religion. It was still the same in its predominating spirit and general operations. But it now brandished the sword of Protestantism. And animated as it felt itself by a new principle of power, deriving (as it were) a flame of activity from the very fires of Heaven; it naturally exerted itself, with a peculiar energy of violence.

In this state of the Scottish nation, but just as it was beginning to breathe after a hard and desperate struggle, and when it was hoping to settle gradually into the calm of an effected reformation; their QUEEN appeared among them. The billows were still heaving from the storm. And her appearance excited a fresh tempest in them, that exceeded the former in its violence, overset the constitution for a time, and wrecked the happiness of the Queen for ever.

§ II.

WITH such a sea of commotions, MARY may seem at first view to have been little qualified to contend, either from nature or from education. Young, beautiful, and accomplished, she had already sat upon the throne of France. She there became the center to a large circle. She appeared in it with a propriety that was acknowledged, and with a gracefulness that was applauded, by all. She was the peculiar ornament, of one of the politest courts in Europe. But her soul was superiour, even to such a state of admiration as this. This had charms to gratify the generality of female minds, to the utmost extent of their wishes. Mary's ambition was of a more exalted kind. She wished to appear as a woman of intellect, and to be considered as a woman of taste. The strength of her talents fitted her well for the one. The high polish which had been given them, calculated her eminently for the other. She therefore shone equally in the drawing-room and in the closet; in the necessary formalities of state, and in the mental intercourses of life. And super-added to all these qualities, she had what is scarcely ever united with them, a native firmness of resolution.

Her youth indeed, her beauty, and her gracefulness, her literature, and her royalty, may seem to have raised her to an eminence of esteem and applause in France, at which she was not properly

perly scanned; and from which some powers of mind were attributed to her perhaps, that she never possessed. Nothing so much imposes upon the spirits of the feeling and the refined, as youth, beauty, and gracefulness, united with literary improvements in a lady. And when these all appear in conjunction upon a throne, they are rated highly beyond their worth, and the world is filled with hyperbolical admirations of them. Yet with every allowance, for the pleasing prejudices of the few in favour of such accomplishments; and with every deduction, for the useful partialities of the many to the side of royalty; she was certainly one of the first women of her age. The very courtiers of Elizabeth, in their very addresses to their mistress; at a time too, when Mary was just escaped from an imprisonment for months, under the tyranny of her own rebels; and when she had actually suffered the horrible indignity of a RAPE, from a confederacy among them*; even then acknowledged her to have an equal vivacity of mind and body; yet to have that sound and sober wisdom, which is of so much greater consequence in life, and qualified her to be peculiarly a woman of business; to possess also a large share of courage;

* Let not the reader suspect, that this asserted fact, because it is not dwelt upon with sufficient distinctness by history, has only grown out of the double meaning of the word *ravishing*; which in England means merely a rape, but in Scotland is generally employed, to signify the seizure of the Queen by the ravisher. The fact is too certain; and I shall insist particularly upon it hereafter.

to be actuated by a frank, a pleasant, and a generous spirit; and to be furnished with a free and eloquent address. “We found hyr in hyr answers,” they say, “to have AN ELOQUENT TONGUE, and a DISCREET HEAD; and it seemeth by hyr doyngs, that she hath stowte COURAGE, and LIBERALLE HART, adjoined thereunto.” They also, in the same moments, expressed their apprehension for the consequences; because a number of gentry from all the adjoining counties of England, had heard “hyr dayly defences and excuses of her innocency, with her great accusations of her enemies, VERY ELOQUENTLY told by her;” and because “a body of hyr AGYLYTIE and SPYRYTE, might escape soone” out of the windows of her English prison*. And one of Cecil’s and Elizabeth’s flatterers says thus, in a letter to Cecil, February the 26th, 1569, after he had seen Mary at Tutbury: “If I (which in the sight of God beare the Quene’s Majestie a naturall love, besyde my bounden dutie) might give advise, there shulde VERAY FEW subjects in this land, HAVE ACCESSE to or CONFERENS WITH this lady; for besyd that she is a goodly personadge (and yet in trouthe not comparable to our Souverain), she hathe withall AN ALLURING GRACE, a prety Scottish speche, and A SERCHING WIT CLOWDED WITH MYLDNES †.” Accordingly, we find Elizabeth’s own council at the

* Goodall, ii. 71 and 72.

† Haynes, 511.

time, to have “feared lest she, who was, as it
 “were, the very PITH and MARROW of SWEET
 “ELOQUENCE, might draw many daily to her
 “part*.” One of the courtiers likewise adds
 in another letter thus, concerning the vigorous
 part of her character. “This lady and princess
 “is a NOTABLE woman,” he says; “she seemeth
 “to regard no ceremonious honor, beside the ac-
 “knowledging of hir estate royal; she sheweth a
 “disposition to SPEYK MOCHE, to be BOLD, to
 “be PLEASANT, and to be VERY FAMILIAR;
 “she sheweth a great desyre, to be avenged of
 “hir enemies; she sheweth a readines to EX-
 “PONE HERSELF TO ALL PERRYLLS, in hope
 “of victory; she desyreth moche to hear of har-
 “dyness and valiancy, commending by name all
 “approved hardy men of hir country, *althoghe*
 “*they be hir enemies*; and she concealeth no cow-
 “ardness, *evin in hir frends †.*” Francis Thynne
 also,

* Camden’s Annals, 110, translation, edit. 4th, 1688. I cite
 and shall cite the translation of this very valuable work, as I
 shall also do by Buchanan’s Detection, in compliment to the
 more unlearned reader. But I shall compare the translation
 with the original, every time. And if there is any real varia-
 tion, I shall take care to note it. In the original, edit. 1st.
 1615, the main words are, “*Quòd quasi Suadæ medulla,*”
 i. 137.

† Anderson, iv. part i. 71. Knox himself furnishes us with
 a striking instance, of her “readiness to expone herself to all
 “perrylls in hope of victory.” Just after her marriage to
 Darnly, and during the rebellion of Murray in consequence
 of it, she and the army, he says, “early in the morning,
 “long befoir the sun was risen, begun to march: bot there
 “arose such a vehement tempest of wind and raine from the
 “west,

also, a continuer and interpolator of Hollingshed's Chronicle, who wrote under the very eye of Elizabeth, and in the very moments of her meditated murder against Mary, says of the latter: that
 "beneficial nature (or rather, good God) had
 "indued her with a beautifull face, a well com-
 "posed bodie, AN EXCELLENT WIT, A MILD
 "NATURE, and GOOD BEHAVIOUR; which she
 "had artificiallie furthered, by courtlie educa-
 "tion and affable demeanour; whereby, AT THE
 "FIRST SIGHT, she WAN UNTO HER THE
 "HEARTS OF MOST PEOPLE *." And her very rebels themselves, in their highest paroxysms of rage and calumny against her, when they had usurped all her power, and while they were actually keeping her person in confinement; could not but confess in the same paper, by which they resolved to charge her with *adultery* and with *murder*, "thay MONY GUDE AND EXCELLENT
 "GIFTS and VIRTUES,—quharewith God some-
 "times indowit her †." Such a confession, from such men, and in such circumstances, is a stronger panegyrick in her favour; than all, which all her

"west, as the like had not bene seie befoir in a long tyme;
 "so that a litill brook turned incontinent into a grit river;
 "and the raging storm being in thair face, with grit difficulty
 "went they forward: and *albeit the most part waxed weary*,
 "yit *the Quene's courage encreasit manlike so much*, that *sche was*
 "*evir with the foremost*. Thare was diverse persons drowned
 "that day in the water of Carren" (Knox, 382, edit. Edinburgh, 1732).

* Hollingshed, ii. 377, edit. 1586.

† Appendix, No. I.

admirers

admirers in France could speak concerning her. Yet she appeared much greater still, from her misfortunes afterward. These called out the native vigour of her mind, and the native dignity of her spirit, in a very extraordinary manner. She rose eminently superiour to them all. She was a heroine in prison. And, even when she bowed her head under the axe of Elizabeth, she appeared with all the look and lustre of majesty; while her tyrannical cousin was trembling on her throne of blood*.

From that scene of admiration in France, however, she was soon called away by the death of her husband, to her own kingdom in the north. She was now to pass from a situation of elegance and of splendour, to the very reign of incivility and turbulence. There most of her accomplishments would be lost. Elegance of taste was little known, among the Scotch of that period. The graces of literature were little cul-

* An Italian writer has accordingly characterized her thus: "Alla bellezza erano accompagnate *gratia stupenda, tratti e maniere impareggiabili, bontà esquisita, intelligenza e discorso sopra ogn' altra donna, possedendo perfettamente 6 lingue, costanza imperturbabile, fede e religione incorrotta*" (Compendi Historici del Conte Alfonso Loschi Vicentino, p. 218. In Venetia, 1652). Some allowance must probably be made for this, as the panegyrick of a papist upon a papist. Perhaps a counter-allowance must equally be made, for the suspicious prejudices of a protestant against both. And yet, even without such a counter-allowance, this single passage gives us a more full and compleat idea of Mary, than any other which I know; though, from the seeming partiality of it, I have thrown it merely into a note.

tivated.

tivated. Barbarism seems scarcely to have smoothed the natural ruggedness of its brow, among the generality of them. Religion was certainly dictating to all, a petulant rudeness of speech and conduct. And both were pressing hard upon the heels of royalty. She was unhappily too, of a different opinion from the great body of her subjects, upon that one topick of religion, which now actuated almost every heart, and directed almost every tongue, among them. This was a point, on which honour could never bend, and by which, of all the possible motives in the world, the human mind is most stiffly strung in opposition. Yet Mary had either moderation enough in her spirit, or discretion enough in her understanding; not to attempt any innovation, on the prevailing faith of protestantism. She allowed her subjects, the full and free exercise of their new religion. She only challenged the same indulgence, for her own. Even this could scarcely be permitted to her, from the fears or from the scruples of the reformers. They had been long in the habit, of encountering the monster of popery. They had therefore worked themselves up, into a high abhorrence of its nature, and into a lively dread of its power. Their passions were violently inflamed by that. Their imaginations were perpetually haunted by this. And they could not let themselves down, to the sober level of reason *.

By

* Lethington himself, one of her greatest rebels afterward, writes

By this means, the sovereign of a kingdom could hardly be allowed the indulgence, which she allowed to the lowest peasant under her government. She could not use it, with the same exemption from disturbances, that he did. She was affronted in her religion. She was insulted in her worship. Those *lucky priests*, who (according to a French observation of more sarcasticalness than propriety) *trample upon the ashes of the Catoes and the Æmilii at Rome* *; under another form, and with an opposite religion, were almost ready to trample upon their Romish Queen in Scotland. The authority of the crown seemed too weak to support itself, even against such adversaries. The national rage of reformation had armed them with a power, of which we can have little conception in more settled times. The zeal of religion, which burned in their own bosoms, gave them a boldness, against which the polished civilities of life formed an ineffectual barrier. And the natural immodesty of power, when it has been newly acquired, and especially when it has been just lodged among the lower orders of life; lent them such an addition of effrontery, that the venerable form of

writes of her to Cecil himself in November 1562; as “a princess *so gentle and benign*, and whose behaviour hath been *always* such towards *all* her subjects, and *every one* in particular; *wonder it is*, that *any* could be found so *ungracious*, as *once* to think evil against her” (Keith 232).

* Les prêtres fortunés foulent d’un pied tranquille
Les tombeaux des Catons et la cendre d’Emile.

majesty itself, seemed to shrink up into insignificance before it*.

Yet this boldness, and this effrontery, might easily have been repressed. A spirited exertion of authority, would soon have done it. Such adversaries are scarcely ever formidable, except when kings make them so by their fears. The crown had vigour enough in itself, crippled as it had been by the late struggles, to have checked this intemperate effusion of zeal, to have kept it from overflowing into these impertinencies of sedition, and to have confined it within its proper chapel. The ministers, who stepped so promptly forward to remonstrate with their Queen on her religion, to violate duty, and to outrage decency, in their addresses to her; if they had found themselves treated, with a little of that rigour which they had provoked, would have slunk away in terror to their respective parishes, have been content to speak disloyalty from their pulpits, and have even sunk the rude clamours of sedition there, into the softer and more suitable tones of devotion.

A firm hand of discipline must speedily have effected this, if these champions of religion had stood only upon their own ground, and had been fighting only with their own forces. But

* Yet Lethington, in the letter of November 1562, assures us; that "her behaviour" had been "such towards these, "that be of the [reformed] religion within her own realm, "yea and the religion itself;" that it was then "a great "deal more *increased* since she came home, than it was before" (Keith 234).

the Scottish clergy were, what almost all clergy in such circumstances will be, only tools and implements in the hands of others. Too rough to be insincere, too honest to be suspicious, too untutored in the world to know it, and too warm about heaven to be wise concerning earth; they were sure to be used by the factious for the prosecution of factious purposes, to become instrumental to mischief which they never designed, and to find themselves at last the unwitting authors of evil, which their worthy hearts abhorred.

§ III.

ONE great infelicity of Mary's life was this, that she had a BROTHER. He was indeed a bastard. He was, therefore, precluded from all possibility of mounting the throne. But he was precluded only by laws. These alone created the impossibility. And laws might be reversed by power. He appears to have been a man of strong and vigorous parts. They were of that kind however, which are most common in the world, and which shew themselves more in the weakness of others, than in their own strength. His vigour was art, not intellect. His parts were a sagacity of genius, which pointed out all the artifice of insidiousness to him; a dexterity of mind, which enabled him to use that artifice with great success; and a versatility of spirit, which qualified him for disguising both to the eyes of the world. With only the title to distinction, which his bastard alliance to the crown

lent him; with only the slender possessions of a bastard, to communicate power; and with only the slight connections of a bastard to furnish influence; he raised himself superiour to his sovereign, and he seated himself on her throne. He had the address likewise, to make the most cunning and the most ambitious of his cotemporaries, to be subservient to *his* cunning, and ministerial to *his* ambition; to commit the enormities themselves, which were necessary to *his* purposes; and even to dip their hands in murder, that *he* might enjoy the sovereignty. But he displayed an address, still greater than this. Though he had not one principle of religion within him; though he had not even one grain of honour in his soul; and though he was guilty of those *more monstrous* crimes, against which God has *peculiarly* denounced damnation; yet he was denominated A GOOD MAN by the Reformers at the time, and he has been considered as an HONEST MAN by numbers to our own days.

He felt the sollicitations of ambition stirring within him, so early and so strongly; that, before he was SEVENTEEN, he entered into a correspondence with the court of England, and engaged in a traitourous conspiracy with it, against his country, his sovereign, and his family*. Such a *youth*, was sure to be a *man* uncommonly busy and factious. He was then a mere ecclesiastick however, with the title of the Prior of St. Andrew's. The laws of the church bending too readily before the pressure of the state, admitted such young ecclesiast-

* Goodall, i. 152.

ticks then, and still admit them, within the regions of popery. He was settled in the church by his royal father, to keep him out of all secular employments, and to prevent all disturbances from his ambition and birth. He afterwards obtained another priory, that of Pittenweem, in his own country; and a third, that of Mascon, in France. He had a dispensation from the Pope for his bastardy, which unqualified him, as it now unqualifies, for possessing any of the endowments of the church. He had also a bull from the Pope, for holding his French priory together with his Scotch preferments. And he took the usual oath of obedience to the Pope*.

But the peaceful duties of a divine, could never have satisfied the keen and restless temper of his spirits. Whatever the sagacity of James the Fifth foresaw, and whatever his prudence endeavoured to avert, by shrouding him in a callock, and fixing him in a stall; all was realized. The turbulent activity of his son's soul, broke through every restraint. The churchman became secularized. The prior was transformed into an earl. And the bastard proved eventually the curse of his father's family. His genius called him out to those scenes principally, where he might have a play for his activity in *cunning*, and might give a scope to his turbulence in *intrigue*. He took his station on the forbidden ground near the throne. His talents for business recommended him to the service of it; and his ambition kept a

* Goodall, i. 152, Lesley's Negotiations in Anderson, iii. 30, and Keith, 75, 146, and 455.

steady eye upon it. The distracted state of the nation, was congenial to a spirit like his. He loved the mazes of political life. He loved to thicken the shades, and to entangle the walks, more and more. He loved to stand himself upon an eminence, in the centre of his own labyrinths; to view all about him, embarrassed by the difficulties which he himself had made; and to enjoy the distress, which he himself was occasioning at the moment. He loved still more, and with a more sanguinary cunning, to raise a tempest around him; to direct it at the heads of those, who stood in the way of his aspiring thoughts; and to sit all the while, seemingly unconcerned in the work. And when the Reformation broke out in all its wildness and strength, he closed in with it; put on the sanctified air of a reformer, wrapped himself up in the long cloke of puritanism, attached all the popular leaders among the clergy to him, and prepared to make them his useful steps to the throne.

§ IV.

BUT even all this united, could not have been effectual to the ruin of Mary. She met with the additional misfortune of having a *cousin* and a *female* upon a neighbouring throne. England was then governed by ELIZABETH. Her character was very different from Mary's. In all the stronger and deeper lineaments of the mind, it was much superiour. But it was much inferiour also, in all the amiable, the elegant, and the dignified graces of the heart and understanding. With a turn of religion,

religion, which gave her a predilection for protestantism; she could have induced herself, I fear, either to continue the idolatrous devotions of popery, to adopt the manly service of the church of England, or to take up the wild worship of the puritans, just as the scale of her interest had strongly inclined *. The voice of her subjects was for the second. She, therefore, became a mother to religion and the church. Yet her regard for either was not sufficient to keep her, from acts of oppression to the one, and from deeds of outrage to the other. She was busy through her whole reign, in robbing the church of its possessions, by every petty trick of sacrilegious imposition, which she could play upon it, and by every bolder exertion of sacrilegious authority, which she could make against it. Her private life, too, was stained with gross licentiousness. The MAIDEN QUEEN had many gallants. And her politicks were one vast system of chicane and wrong, to all the nations about her.

She was particularly fond of embarrassing them with dissensions among themselves, that she might be secure from their attempts upon her. This

* Accordingly we find even Knox himself, speaking of her in this manner. "The armes of England," he says, "wer befor usurped by our soverane, and by her husband Francis; and Elizabethe, quene of England, was of the Guislanes reputed littill better than a bastard.—The effect quhareof will soner apeir, then the godly of England wald desyre. And yet is sche that now reigneth over *thame*, *nether gude protestant nor yet resolute papist*, let the warld juge quhilk is the *thrid*," meaning an UNBELIEVER. "Quene Elizabeth, we say," &c. (P. 277.)

low and ungenerous kind of management, indeed, shelters itself with the many, who have virtue enough to startle at an open knavery, under the dignified appellation of necessity. But let us not injure our hearts, by imposing upon our understandings. Dishonesty is never necessary. God never did, God never will, create a necessity for knavery. Man alone does this, and then has the impudence to charge his own forgery upon God. But Elizabeth and her ministers, I doubt not, whatever they might pretend to the virtuous body of the nation, triumphed in the happy inventiveness of their souls for mischief; exulted over their long and laboured trains of misery; and considered themselves as the wise and intelligent spirits of the creation, who sat in their orbs, presided over their elements, and regulated the movements of all with their fingers. They knew not that they were thus making themselves the very DÆMONS OF VENGEANCE, to all within the sphere of their activity. They reflected not, that history would in time break through the clouds, in which they had wrapped themselves up for their mischievous purposes; and expose them in their fiend-like operations, to the gaze of men. And while the subjects of Elizabeth were applauding the stratagems of policy, which she was practising upon the states around them; and were enjoying their success, in the tranquillity of their own country, and in the distractions of others: they were little aware, that the hour was soon to come, when by the just retributions of an indignant Providence, those states should play back upon us the stratagems,

stratagems, which had been practised upon them; should foment disturbances among us, by the same arts of unhallowed wisdom; should triumph over us with an equal success, from them; and should help to work us up, into all the frenzy of fanatics, and into all the insanity of regicides. May the strong and awful retaliation, be a lesson of national wisdom for ages.

Elizabeth, however, had some special grounds of animosity against Mary. The latter had a title, such as it was, to the throne of the former. This was naturally preferred by the prejudices of the papist, to the right of Elizabeth herself. Mary had even assumed the arms and appellation of Queen of England, when she was queen of France*. And though she had forborne to take them, ever since she became her own mistress; Elizabeth had none of that generosity about her, which could forgive. She had been alarmed. She was still alarmed. The papists continued the claim, though Mary had resigned it. She might one day see a formidable competitor for the crown in her, supported by all the popish faction in the island, and seconded by all the popish powers on the continent. Elizabeth's life was a life of mischief and of misery; of mischief to others, in the

* This petty offence, of which so much use was made, was nearly equalled *at the very time*, by Elizabeth's bearing the arms and appellation of Queen of France. See Forbes, i. 139, 259, and 339. Only, Mary took them on the accession of Elizabeth, and actually dated her reign over England and Ireland from that period. See Forbes, i. 404, and ii. 185.

plots which she was always forming against them ; and of misery to herself, in the fears and apprehensions which she was always entertaining of them. She was continually forging schemes of malignity against them, from some visionary fears of her own concerning them. She then changed her visionary into real fears, from the jealousies which she conceived of their retaliating upon her. And she was finally obliged to fabricate new schemes of mischief against them, in order to prevent or to counteract the designs, which she was sure they *would* form against her, because she was sensible they had every *right* to form them. Thus does Providence punish the insidious with airy suspicions at first, torment them with well-grounded jealousies afterwards, and curse them at last with the success of their own machinations.

But this was not all. In the eyes of both papists and protestants, Mary had a right of eventual succession to the crown. If Elizabeth should die without legitimate issue, by all the principles of the constitution Mary was to fill her place. The expectation of this, made Mary to resign the other. And, by the hope of this, Elizabeth might have managed her completely. But that Queen had a weakness, often incident to strong passions and little religion. She viewed her successor as such, with an eye of malignity. She could not bear to see another ready, even after her death, to step into the vacant throne. She, therefore, kept the succession undetermined to the last. She thus endangered all the happiness of her kingdom, merely for the gratification
of

of her humour. She suffered the law of Henry her father, which in a *gust* of ill-will, and in a *freak* of tyranny, had broke through the natural course of descent, and cut off the race of Scotland from the succession; still to remain unrepealed against them: though she had once had the same sort of law, and from the same kind of principle, made against herself. She was the *genuine* daughter of Henry! She carried the impression of his mind, strongly stamped upon her. She particularly did so on this occasion. She had *her* gusts of ill-will and *her* freaks of tyranny. She equally sacrificed the grand lines of the constitution to them. She even proceeded farther in both, than ever Henry did. She had it once enacted indirectly, but plainly, by a law, that the crown should be worn after her death by her NATURAL ISSUE; a designation of her offspring, that, in its *ordinary* import, comprehends equally the spurious and the legitimate, and, in its *legal* acceptance, peculiarly means the spurious. She even prohibited any of her subjects, by the terrour of severe penalties in the law; from intimating in any manner or form, who was the next heir to the crown after her death, except it was her NATURAL ISSUE*. She even died at last, though she

* Statutes at large, 13^o. c. 1. s. 2, and Camden, Transf. 167, and Orig. i. 205. This was in 1571. But at the treaty, which was held in 1570 between Mary and Elizabeth, it was specified by the latter, that the former should succeed to the throne, "in case of Elizabeth's demise without ANY issue." Mary altered the limitation thus, without any LAWFUL issue." And Elizabeth would agree only to have it altered thus,

she had no issue at all, without settling who was to succeed her; leaving the constitutional heirs of the throne under the ban of a prohibitory law, suffering no others to be appointed, and resigning up the nation to all the horrors of a civil war. These, indeed, the good sense of the nation happily prevented. With one concurrent voice, they broke through the prohibitory law. They did what Elizabeth should have done. They called the constitutional heirs to the throne. But Elizabeth must have meant the reverse of all this. She meant to leave "her good people," that worst of all political calamities to a nation, an unsettled succession. She must have foreseen all the rising evils of it; yet she still left it. She left it, as a *legacy of mischief* after her death. Though counselled by her parliaments, and entreated by her people, she still persisted in her obstinacy of not ascertaining the succession. She even did worse. She prepared the way for additional pretenders to the crown, from any real or asserted bastards of thus, "without issue BY ANY LAWFUL HUSBAND." Haynes, 608 and 614. This remarkable fact, which was prior to the law, shews us in union with it the firmness of audacity, with which Elizabeth pursued her purposes upon the succession. She tried at first to make way for ANY issue. She then adhered resolutely to any *by a lawful husband*, because she could cure the bastardy by a marriage. And she at last spoke out with more than her original explicitness, spoke out even to her parliament, and had her *natural* issue by name rendered capable of succeeding her. Indeed, the existence of such a law as this upon our statute-book, is a full proof of the effrontery of Elizabeth in vice, and of the obsequiousness of the nation in meanness; and the law itself stands as a strong note of infamy upon both, at present.

her

her own. She thus did all she could do in her life, to make England

— A stage,
To feed contention in a lingering act.

And it is therefore the less to be wondered at, that she persecuted a woman, who was her cousin by blood and her heir by right, *because* she was her cousin and her heir.

But there was still another motive, and of as hostile a nature as any before, and perhaps more powerful than any; in the conduct of Elizabeth to Mary. The former could not be content with the great superiority, which she had over the latter; in a hardy vigour of understanding, in a deep knowledge of the world, and in the mysterious refinements of policy, in the strength of her nation, and in the splendour of her government. She must arrogate a superiority too, in the very orb in which Mary shone so transcendently. She must triumph over her in beauty, and in dress; in those very accomplishments, which give the sex such an influence upon us, but in which we never think of rivalling them. Elizabeth was a *man* in most other respects. She should have been peculiarly one in this. But the womanly part of her predominated here, over the manly. And she who could *box* her *generals* upon occasion, could not bear to be surpassed in accomplishments purely feminine, by the most handsome, the most graceful, and the most improved princess of her age.

All united to make Elizabeth an enemy to Mary. As a queen, and as a woman; as actuated

ated by political jealousies, as stimulated by personal humours, and as impelled by female vanities; she became at first a pretended friend to betray her, and she appeared at last an open enemy to destroy her. She lavished all her arts of deception upon her. She then found herself so entangled in the strings of her own nets, that she could not either retreat or advance. And she thought herself obliged in the end, for the sake of her own security, to terminate in desperation, what she had commenced in jealousy. She arraigned a queen of Scotland, before a tribunal of English nobles. She thus set an example, infamous in itself, pernicious to society, and peculiarly pernicious and infamous to her own country; of having a sovereign condemned to the block, by subjects. She urged her meaner dependents upon ASSASSINATING Mary, that she might not behead her. But she found even *their* consciences revolting, at the villainous intimation. She then signed the bloody warrant, with her own hand. She could be wantonly jocular, at doing it. She could pretend to recall it, when it had been sent away. She could pretend to lay the guilt of it upon her secretary's head. She could yet deny to Mary for ever, what was never denied to the meanest criminal before; the favour of having a clergyman of her own communion, to attend her. She could point her persecution against the *soul*, as well as the body, of Mary*.

And

* Camden, Transf. 279, 368, and Orig. i. 336, 439, and 445.

And at length she stained her conscience with one of the foulest murders, that the annals of earth can produce; then felt herself almost petrified with horror, at the related execution of what she had commanded; felt herself peculiarly haunted at the close of life, with the frightful image of the deed which she had committed; and

“Two things,” says Mary to Elizabeth in 1582, when she thought her malady a mortal one, “I have principally
“to require at the close: the one, that, near as I am to going out of this world, I may have with me, for my consolation, some honourable churchman; to remind me daily
“of the course which I have to finish, and teach me how to
“complete it according to my religion, in which I am firmly
“resolved to live and to die. This is a last duty, which
“cannot be denied to the most mean and miserable person
“that lives.—And that I in this extremity should be deprived
“of such freedom, you cannot with justice require. What
“advantage will redound to you, when you shall deny it to
“me? I hope that God will excuse me, if, oppressed by you
“in this manner, I do not render to him any duty, but what
“I shall be permitted to do in my heart” (Appendix, No. xvii).

Just before her death also in 1586-7, “earnestly she besought, that she might have a catholick priest allowed her, to direct her conscience, and administer the sacraments unto her.” Even this was refused her. They recommended *two protestants* to her. “A bishop and a dean—they commended her for this purpose.” And, only the very day before her death, “she prayed,—that she might have conference with her—confessor—; it was flatly denied, that he should come at her” (Camden, Transf. 368 and 382. Orig. i. 439 and 445). See also Robinson, iii. 477. Pure and genuine cruelty, I believe, was never carried to a higher pitch than this.

..... Siculi non invenère tyranni
Tormentum majus.

and killed herself at last with a fullen bravery of melancholy, the most extraordinary that is to be met with in history. Hear this, all ye who are tempted by the solicitations of artifice, to leave the line of rectitude, and to violate the laws of conscience. Ye will be dreadfully breaking in upon your bosom-peace, by the deed. One enormity is sure to lead you to another. Ye will feel yourselves at the end of all, surrounded with your own stratagems, encircled with your own snares, and bound fast in the very center of your own designs. And ye will then, like the wretched Elizabeth, fancy yourselves compelled to cut your way through them, with crimes, with horror, and with damnation attending upon you *.

ON

* The very extraordinary melancholy of Elizabeth has been attributed, by what I may surely call the injudiciousness of history, to her pardon of Tyrone, to her putting Essex to death, or to the observed indifference of her people concerning her declining health. But these are reasons apparently of too frivolous a nature, for the production of such a wonderful effect. And I have, therefore, referred it to the only incident of her reign, which can be considered as any way adequate to it; and which indeed seems naturally to prepare the reflecting mind, for such a dreadful counterpart at last. I accordingly subjoin the best account that we have, and one little known, of the dying moments of Elizabeth. "When I came to court," says Robert Cary, Earl of Monmouth, in his *Memoirs of his own Life*, "I found the
"Queene ill-disposed, and shee kept her inner lodging; yet
"shee, hearing of my arrivall, sent for mee. I found her in
"one of her withdrawing chambers, *sitting low upon her cush-*
"ions. Shee called mee to her, I kist her hand, and told her

"it

§ V.

ON these flagitious principles, and with this horrible issue to them, Elizabeth engaged in intrigues against Mary. She banded with her ambitious brother, and her seditious clergy. She furnished them with assistance secretly. She lent them her countenance openly. And, from both, they at length drove their sovereign out of the country. She took refuge in Elizabeth's dominions. She thus gave her one of the finest op-

“it was my cheifest happinesse to see her in safety and in
 “health, which I wished might long continue. Shee took
 “mee by the hand, and *wrung it hard*, and said, “No, Ro-
 “bin, I am not well;” and then discoursed with mee of her
 “indisposition, and that *her heart had been sad and heavy for ten*
 “*or twelve dayes*, and in her discourse *she fetched not so few as*
 “*forty or fifty great sighes*. I was grieved at the first to see her
 “in this plight; for, IN ALL MY LIFE-TIME BEFORE, I
 “NEVER KNEW HER FETCH A SIGH, BUT WHEN THE
 “QUEENE OF SCOTTES WAS BEHEADED. THEN, upon my
 “knowledge, she shed *many teares and sighes*—. I used the
 “best words I could, to perswade her from this melancholy
 “humour; but I found by her, *it was too deep rooted in her*
 “*heart*, and hardly to be removed. This was upon a Satur-
 “day night.” From the next day “forwards, she grew worse
 “and worse. She *remained upon her cushions, four dayes and*
 “*nights at the least*. All about her *could not persuade her,*
 “*either to take any sustenance, or go to bed.*—The Queene
 “grew worse and worse, *because she would be so*, none about
 “her being able to perswade her *to go to bed*. My Lord Ad-
 “mirall was sent for—; what *by faire meanes*, what *by force*,
 “he gatt her to bed. There was no hope of her recovery,
 “*because she refused all remedies*. On Wednesday the twenty-
 “third of March, she grew speechless.” And that night she
 died (P. 136—140).

portunities,

portunities, that time had ever presented to an heroical mind, of acting with a dignified spirit of honour at the last. Mary was surely reduced below her *envy* at present. She had been ravished by one of her brutal barons. She had been exposed as a captive, to all the scorn of her rabble. She had been locked up in a dungeon within a lake. She had been there committed to the care of that very woman, who was the mother of her bastard brother; who insulted over her with the natural insolence of a whore's meanness, in asserting the legitimacy of her own child, and in maintaining the illegitimacy of Mary*; and actually carried the natural vulgarity of a whore's impudence so far, as to strip her of all her royal ornaments, and to dress her up like a mere child of fortune, in a "course broune cassoke †." She had even been accused of ADULTERY to her late husband. She had even been charged with the MURDER of him. And she had been thus charged and accused, not in the private discourses, or the private publications, of the rebels; but in full form, in open parliament, and in the hearing of all the world. In such a situation, all the little jealousies of the rival will surely melt away, in the compassions of the woman. Nor can she any longer be *afraid* of Mary. The dreaded competitor for the crown of England, has now lost her own; and now lies (as it were) at her feet, soliciting her kindness,

* Camden's Transf. 94. Orig. i. 117. Crawford 49, and Jebb, i. 404 and 465.

† Lesley's Defence of Q. Mary's Honour, 36. Anderson, i.

and imploring her assistance. Every generous sentiment, that ever harboured in the mind of Elizabeth, will therefore be called into life again. Every tender sensibility, that ever was felt at the heart of Elizabeth, will again be roused into activity. Both will unite their powers. And Elizabeth will eagerly catch, at the happy opportunity for glory; will seal it down to her honour, in all the future ages of our annals; and will descend to posterity with these illustrious titles, the Friend of Order, the Assertor of Justice, and the Vindicator of an Injured Queen.

But Elizabeth had no sensibilities of tenderness, and no sentiments of generosity. She looked not forward to the awful verdict of history. She shuddered not at the infinitely more awful doom of God. Regardless of her own invitation, of her own promises, and of every sanction human or divine; she flew upon the unhappy Queen, seized her as a prey, and imprisoned her as a felon. I blush as an Englishman to think, that it was an English Queen who could do this; that it was one of the most enlightened princes, that ever sat upon the throne of England; and that it was one, whose name I was taught to lip in my infancy, as the honour of her sex, and the glory of our isle*.

* How different the conduct of Mary would have been, if she had stood in the situation of Elizabeth, and Elizabeth in hers; we may be morally certain, from a slight stroke in one of Mary's letters to Elizabeth. "*In that you trust me,*" she says on July 5, 1568, "*I will not (to die for it) deceive you.*" Robertson, ii. 453, edit. 4th, which I always quote, except I say to the contrary at the time.

Yet she did even *more* than this. She obliged the unwilling rebels, to come forward with their asserted evidences against her. She forced them upon pretending, to substantiate their accusation of adultery, and to authenticate their charge of murder. And, at last, she entered into a DIABOLICAL COMPACT with them, to receive their spurious evidences as genuine; to receive them in such a manner, as should preclude all possibility of detecting their spuriousness; and to vouch them for genuine, by her own authority: so to blast the character of Mary with all the world, for the gratification of her own paltry revenge; and then to keep her in prison for life, or to deliver her up to her rebels, for the support of their scandalous usurpation.

Nor let it be suspected, that I exaggerate in saying this. The records of it all are still in being. They are indelible monuments of the infamy of Elizabeth, and of the innocence of Mary. And I shall lay them at full length before my readers*.

CHAP.

* See particularly Goodall, i. 403—404, for some state-papers of the time, and Robertson, ii. 455, 456, and 457, for Lord Hennis's letter. But the circumstance of Elizabeth's invitation and promise, is laid open in its fullest force, by two papers presented by Mary's commissioners to *Elizabeth herself*. These are therefore the best vouchers: yet they have never been cited to appear. On the 16th of December, 1568, one of those commissioners addressed Elizabeth thus. "Mary," he says, came into England "upon *divers* and *sindrie* faithful "promises past *befoir* betwixt zour [your] Hienes and hir, "and *confirmit* be *writingis* and *taikinis* laitlie sent betwixt "zour

CHAPTER II.

§ I.

MARY was one of those characters, which we meet with very seldom in the world; and which, whenever they appear, are applauded for their generosity by a few, and condemned for their simplicity by the many. They have an easy affiance of soul, that loves to repose confidence, even when confidence is weakness. They thus go on, still confiding, and still confounded; unable to check the current of affiance which runs strong in their bosoms, and suffering themselves to be driven before it in their actions. And all the first half of their lives forms one continued tissue, of confidences improperly placed, and of perfidies natural to be expected. Such a person was Mary! She once had her

“zour Majestie and hir; and *last* of all, as zour Majestie has
 “*knewin*, be Beton” (Goodall, ii. 265). And the same
 commissioner, the very next day (see *errata* prefixed to *ibid.*
 v. i. and introd. p. 7), addressed Elizabeth again, with re-
 minding her of the “*sindrie* promises of friendship, amitie,
 “and mutual assistance, *affirmit be tokenis* and *writingis*; and
 “*last* of all, be *resaving the ring* again fra Beton, immedi-
 “ately efter hir delivering furth of Lochlevin [her prison],
 “*quhilks* zour Majestie had geven and *interchangit*, as a pledge
 “of amitie and promise of help to uthers [each other] mutu-
 “allie, quhensoever occasioun sould require” (*Ibid.* ii. 384).

bastard brother, and his adherents, under her feet; but too easily forgave them. She once had all her other rebels, under the harrows of the law; but too readily released them. The former rose in rebellion, and were defeated. The latter murdered her foreign secretary in her presence, and even imprisoned her own person in her palace; and yet were overpowered by the management of the Queen, and the fidelity of her peers. And she not only allowed them, to return home from their banishment; but restored them to their estates, to their honours, and even to their posts about her court. She thus enabled them to repeat their rebellions, with equal power and with improved experience. In so doing, she was certainly guilty of great folly. Yet she did more than this. She afterwards took the *verbal assurances*, of the very same men in rebellion; who, to be rebels at first, must have previously broken through the strongest assurances that man can give, even their very oaths; and who, to be rebels again, must have violated every additional obligation of gratitude and honour. But she took their words, notwithstanding. She relied upon them so implicitly, as to put her person into their hands. Then they behaved, just as such ungrateful, dishonourable, and perjured wretches were sure to behave. They thrust her into a prison. They forced her to resign her crown. They nominally placed her son on the throne, and really fixed themselves upon it. By her affability, dignity, and prudence, she won upon the hearts of those about her. By their aid

aid she escaped out of prison. She escaped too at a critical period, when the villains that detained her in prison, were resolving to execute the menaces which they had been for some time throwing out, and were meditating their grand stroke of murder against her *. Yet she was still the same in this point. Her late experience, very severe as it was, had not cured this original milkiness of her mind. She was still credulous in the honesty of mankind, and still confident of the sincerity of others. She raised an army in an instant. She was defeated, however. And she again repeated the nearly fatal stroke of confidence before. She flew from the perfidies of her rebels, and threw herself upon the perfidies of Elizabeth. She found Elizabeth even more perfidious than they. And from *this* exertion of abused confidence, she could never recover herself afterwards.

Nor let her be too freely censured for all. In the present constitution of things, where the original dignity of man is in a perpetual conflict with the introduced spirit of meanness; that affection of the heart, which does it most credit in reality, becomes its greatest reproach in the eyes of the many. A generous confidence in the virtue of others, is the mark of a soul, conscious of the energy of virtue in itself, buoyed up by its own vigour within, and not yet drawn down by

* Anderson, iv. part. 1, 31. "Lors qu'ils pansoyent me fayre mourir." Mary's own letter a few days afterward to Elizabeth. And see Appendix, No. xvii. for the menaces.

the attraction of earth below. Mary's was of this kind. Time, if time had been allowed her, would have forced her to learn the necessary wisdom of the world. The great multitude of mankind learn it, without the aid of time. They look into their own hearts, and read it there. They have no stubbornness of virtue to subdue, and no forwardness of honour to restrain. Mary had. She was cast in a much superiour mould. And she died at last a martyr, to the sincerity of virtue in herself, and to a reliance upon it in others*.

She took refuge in England on the 16th of May, 1568; being little more than TWENTY-FIVE years old. On the 22d of June following, the bastard brother, now Earl of Murray and regent of Scotland, addressed himself to Elizabeth's agent at Edinborough in these terms.

* This amiable weakness in Mary, though the marking element in her composition, was first noticed by Mr. Tytler, in 285—286, edit. 3d, and he ought to have the honour of the discovery. But let me add to his and my remark, that this weakness was the glorious cause, so linked are our weaknesses and our glories together, of an awfully pleasing emanation of amiableness. When she heard of the sudden death of Murray; of his being, by one vindictive stroke of murder,

Cut off ev'n in the blossoms of his sins,

.....

No reckoning made, but sent to his account

With all his imperfections on his head,

And indeed

With all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May;
the Queen *lamented* over his hasty summons into eternity,
and *wept* over the fall of her savage and unnatural persecutor
(Camden, Orig. i. 172, Transf. 140, and Jebb, ii. 75).

“ Because

“ Because we perfave the trial,” he said, “ *qubilk*
 “ *the Quenis Majestie*” of England “ *is myndit to*
 “ *have taken*, is to be usit with grit ceremonye
 “ and solemniteis; we wald be maist laith [most
 “ loth] to enter in accusatioun of the Quene,
 “ moder of the king our foverane, and syne
 “ [afterwards] to enter into qualification with
 “ hir: for all men may judge, how dangerous
 “ and prejudicial that suld be. Alwayis, in cais
 “ the Quenis Majestie WILL HAVE the ACCUSA-
 “ TION DIRECTLIE TO PROCEID: it were maist
 “ reffonabill we understude *qubat we suld luke to*
 “ *follow thairupon*, in cais we preive all that we
 “ alledge; utherwayis we fal be als [as] incer-
 “ tane efter the caus concludit, as we are pre-
 “ sentlie [at present]. And thairfoir we pray zow
 “ [you] require hir Hienes, *in this point* to re-
 “ solve us *.” Murray wanted not to bring for-
 ward the accusation of Mary. He was already
 in possession of the regency. He could not be
 in possession of more, even if he succeeded in
 the accusation. He might not succeed. He
 knew well the defectiveness of his proofs. He
 was, therefore, very naturally full of apprehen-
 sions concerning the event. But Elizabeth *would*
have the accusation to proceed. And he was
 scheming plainly to make a formal agreement
 with her, before he ventured to produce his
 evidences. He saw the eagerness of the Queen,

* Appendix, No. iii. at the end of vol. 3d. Mr. Goodall, in preface p. x, by mistake calls it “ Murray’s note to Mid-
 “ dlemore, the *eighth* of June;” which is the date of Eliza-
 beth’s letter to Murray. Goodall, ii. 73.

to have them produced. He durst not refuse her. The slightest assistance lent to Mary against him, would have overset him at once from his seat of usurpation. Yet he prudently refused to gratify her, before he had entered into some stipulations to his own advantage. He would be left in the regency by Elizabeth, if he proved his charges; and Mary should never be assisted by Elizabeth, in disturbing him.

Thus plainly did Elizabeth urge the unwilling Murray, to come forward with a charge of adultery, and with a charge of murder, against Mary. Yet, at this very time, she was pretending to Murray himself, *not* to intend to invite any charges against her; *not* to mean to allow of any faults in her; and merely to design a settlement of all differences between her and him, upon reasonable terms. So hypocritical was she, at the very outset of the business! Yet she was still more so. At this very time, when she was stimulating Murray to accuse Mary, and yet telling him she did not want him to accuse her; she was then pressing Mary to agree to a conference with Murray, *in order to give opportunity for introducing the accusation*, and yet under an express stipulation of *making Murray by it to restore the crown to Mary*. These two facts together, unite to form such an extreme of hypocrisy, and such a comprehensiveness of dissimulation; as is scarcely to be credited. I therefore proceed to prove them.

We have already seen, that “the Quenis Majesty was myndit to have a trial taken” concerning Mary, and that she “*would have the*
“accusation

“accufation directlie to proceed” againſt her. Yet in a ſet of objections and answers, written by her prime-minifter Cecil himſelf, and relating to this meſſage of Murray’s, “the Quene’s Ma-
 “jeſty,” it is ſaid, “never meaneth ſo to deale
 “in the cauſe, as to proceed to any condemna-
 “tion of the Queen of Scots; but *hath a deſyre,*
 “*to compound all differences betwixt hir and hir*
 “*ſubjects*; and therein not to *allow any faults,*
 “that ſhall appear to be in the Quene; but by
 “reaſonable and honourable conditions *to make*
 “*ſome good end,* with ſufficient ſuerty for *all* par-
 “tyes*.” And at the ſame time, as Mary her-
 ſelf informs us, “hir Grace of hir guidneſs did
 “promise to *ſupport* me, and to *reſpone me in my*
 “*awin realme* be hir grace’s forces onlie; quhair
 “throw I miſterit not [I ſhould not trouble my-
 “ſelf] to require any uther prince, for aſſiſtance
 “in my cauſis; and, in hoip theirow, deſyrit me
 “ERNESTLIE to deſiſt and ceis fra all ſuit, at the
 “king of Spain and uther princes handis for ſup-
 “port; quhilk deſyre I obeyit, putting my hail
 “confidence, nixt God, in hir Grace’s promiſes.”
 With ſuch a variation of hypocrify, was Eliza-
 beth acting at this moment! But having thus
 induced Mary to drop all applications to foreign
 princes for aid, by a ſolemn promiſe of reſtoring
 her to her crown, with her own foldiery; ſhe
 then began to falter a little in her promiſe.
 “Then,” ſays Mary, “hir Grace thinking it to
 “be mair meit, that all my cauſis ſould be ſet

* Goodall, ii. 89.

“ forward be sum gude drefs, *rather than be force*;
 “ hir Hienes defyrit me alswa VERY ERNESTLIE,
 “ to suffer hir a short space to travel with the
 “ Erle of Murray and his adherents (*quba had*
 “ *submittit thair baill causis in hir handis*), to
 “ cause thame REPAIR THE WRANGIS AND AT-
 “ TEMPTATIS COMMITTIT AGANIS ME THEIR
 “ SOVERANE, and contrair thair alledgeance and
 “ dewtie; and TO DESIST AND CEIS IN TIMES
 “ CUMING; quhair throw I micht be REPOSIT
 “ in my realme, auctoritie and government
 “ thairof, but [without] ony impediment, and be
 “ her Hienes’s labouris and moyen, *rather than*
 “ *be force of armis*; desyring alswa, that I wald
 “ use hir counsal toward the WRANG and OF-
 “ FENCES committit be thame, how the famin
 “ fould be REPAIRIT to my honour, and my
 “ CLEMENCIE BE USIT TOWARDIS THAME be
 “ hir Grace’s sicht *.” So explicit was she still,
 in her promise of restoring Mary to her throne;
 even when she was forming her plan, for keeping
 her out of it.

Nor let any doubt arise upon the mind of my
 reader, as to the validity of Mary’s evidence
 against Elizabeth. She must be the only evidence
 of what she only can know, the contents of Eli-
 zabeth’s letters to her. All indeed is confirmed
 by a memorial, which her commissioner, the
 bishop of Ross, *presented to Elizabeth herself*. At
 Mary’s coming into England, he says to Eliza-
 beth, “ Zour Majestie causit hir to be thankfullie

* Goodall, ii. 338—339.

“ reffavit,

“ reffavit, and TUIK IN HAND TO DRESS HIR
 “ CAUSIS TO HIR HONOUR AND WEILL; fobeit
 “ fcho wald leive the feiking of ayd and support
 “ of all uther princes, and ftay hirfelf onlie upon
 “ zour Hienes; quhilk, upon the truſt foirſaid,
 “ fcho willinglie obeyit *.” But, what doubly
 confirms all, Elizabeth at this very time, ſays the
 ſame biſhop in a treatiſe afterwards, “ did aſſure
 “ the moſte Chriſtian Kinge of Fraunce,” of
 ſucceſs in this treaty; “ promiſinge to doe her
 “ exact diligence, to procure THE RESTITUTION
 “ OF THE Q. OUR SOVEREIGNE TO HER CROWNE
 “ AND REALMES, and a goode agreement to be
 “ made amongeſt her ſubjects, for the commoun
 “ quietnes of the realme †.” And, to preclude
 all poſſibility of doubt, Sir Francis Knollys in-
 forms Cecil by a letter of July 28th, 1568; that
 my Lord Herris, juſt returned from Elizabeth to
 Mary, aſſured the latter in his and Lord Scroop’s
 requested preſence: He was authorized by Eli-
 zabeth to ſay, “ yf ſhe wold commyt hyr cauſe
 “ to be heard by hyr Hyghnes order,—as—
 “ hyr deare couſine and frende,—hyr Hyghnes
 “ WOULD SURELY SETT HYR AGAYNE IN HYR
 “ SEATE OF REGIMENT AND DIGNITYE RE-
 “ GALL;” if her rebels ſhould bring any ſatisſac-
 tory reaſons for their behaviour, “ conditionally,”
 that her rebels ſhould be pardoned; and, if they
 did not, “ then her Hyghnes WOULD ABSOLUTELY

* Goodall, ii. 384.

† Leſley’s Negotiations, 24. Anderſon, iii.

“SETT HYR IN HYR SEAT REGALL*.” So seemingly mounted up to the very *apex* of hypocrisy at once, does Elizabeth here appear! So seemingly does the first stroke of the pencil, complete the picture of dissimulation in her! But we shall see her picture heightened, with a thousand touches of dissimulation besides; and herself mounting infinitely higher on the pinnacle of hypocrisy, hereafter.

Murray's overture to Elizabeth, is the fundamental evidence of all. To that overture Elizabeth undoubtedly acceded. We have not, indeed, her immediate answer to it; though we know that she actually returned one. “When
“their lettres, contayning the doubt before by
“them moved,” say the commissioners of Elizabeth to Murray and Murray's associates, a little afterwards at York, “were delivered to the
“Quene's Majestie's handes; they knew that *im-*
“*mediately* *hir Highnes did forthwith depeche*
“*[dispatch] her answer thereunto †.*” This answer has been lost. We have what is called an answer, in the objections and replies which I have

* Anderson, iv. part. i. 109—110. So Lord Herris says in a letter of September the 3d, 1568, concerning Elizabeth and Mary: “Sen that time” of Mary's coming into England, “the Queen's Majestie” of England “has commanded me
“*diverse times* to declare, *she would accept her cause, and do*
“*for her, and to put her in peaceable possession of this realme*” (Robertson, ii. 455). See also 457. In consequence of this promise, Mary with equal propriety and dignity exclaimed a little before her murder, “Hæc dextra fidesque?” and, “Sic nos in sceptrâ reponis?”

† Goodall, ii. 127.

just mentioned, as drawn up by Cecil with a view to this letter of Murray's. But, as those could be only the rudiments of an answer, so could they not be of the real and actual one. They carry with them the appearance, of a paper merely *ostensible*. Let the reader judge, from one of the objections and replies. “*Obj.* They would
 “ be loth to enter fyrst into an accusation of the
 “ Quene, and then after that to enter into a qua-
 “ lification. *Ans.* The Quene's Majesty never
 “ ment to *have any to come, to make any accusa-*
 “ *tion of the Queen:* but meaning to have *some*
 “ *good end to grow* betwixt the Quene and hir
 “ subjectis, was content to hear any thing which
 “ they had to say for themselves; and, if they
 “ will come into hir Majesty's realme, they shall
 “ be heard *.”

This evidently bears such an air of hypocrisy upon the face of it, as could never be hoped to be successfully imposed upon a Murray. It could be calculated only, for his exhibition of it to some of his honefter adherents. Such a hypocrite as Murray, is never to be taken in by dissimulation. Nor will such a hypocrite as Elizabeth, ever attempt to do it. And that it was not the real answer given to Murray, is plain from what are equally satisfactory to us, with the real one itself; but which are very different, from this ostensible one of Cecil's; the instructions of Elizabeth to her commissioners afterwards, and a letter of Elizabeth's to Murray, dated the same day with the instructions.

* Goodall, ii. 69.

“ Where

“ Where we hear say,” says Elizabeth on September the 20th to Murray, “ that certain reports are made in fundry parts of Scotland ; “ that whatsoever should fall out now upon the “ hearing of the Queen of Scotts cause, in any “ proof to convince [convict] or to acquit the “ said Queen, concerning the horrible murder of “ her late husband our cousin ; *we have determined to restore her to her kingdom and government* : we do so MUCH MISLIKE HEREOF, as “ WE CANNOT INDURE THE SAME TO RECEIVE “ ANY CREDIT ; and therefore we have thought “ good to assure you, that the same is UNTRULY “ DEVISED by the authors TO OUR DISHONOUR. “ For as we have been always certified from our “ said sister, both by her letters and messages, that “ she is by no means guilty or participant of that “ murder, which we wish to be true ; so surely, “ if she should be found justly to be guilty “ thereof, as hath been reported of her, whereof “ we would be very sorry ; then, indeed, it “ should behove us to consider otherwise of her “ cause, than to satisfy her desire, in restitution “ of her to the government of that kingdom. “ And so we would have YOU AND ALL OTHERS “ THINK, that should be disposed to conceive “ HONOURABLY of us and our actions*.” This is sufficiently explicit. But let us turn to the instructions, which are equally dated on the 20th of September, in the grand commission for the whole. These do, what Elizabeth’s letter does

* Robertson, ii. 387.

not. These plainly refer to Murray's message before. These directly reply to it. And they run thus. "If the Earle of Murray and his party shall alledge," she says, "that although they can justly convince [convict] the Quene of the great crimes wherewith she hath been burdened; yet they find it not expedient so to do, *upon the doubt they have*, that the Quene's Majesty will, notwithstanding any crime proved upon her, *restore her to her kingdom and rule*, whereupon they should never be free from her indignation; and so they will *stay and not proceed*, without they may *know* her Majestie's purpose, in case the said Quene should be proved guilty of her husband's murder: it may be answered by the Quene's Majestie's commissioners, that, *if her Majestie shall find it to be plainly and manifestly proved*, surely her Majestie would think hir UNWORTHY OF A KINGDOM; and would NOT STAYNE HER OWN CONSCIENCE, by RESTORING HER TO A KINGDOM *." All therefore shews us very plainly, the answer of Elizabeth to the overture of Murray; that answer which she returned, as the commissioners have told us already, "immediately" and "forthwith" upon the receipt of Murray's doubts. If he could convict Mary of the crimes with which he charged her, he would have no need to enter into any accommodation with her. Mary was never to be restored by Elizabeth. Yet all the while, let me again re-

* Goodall, ii, 99.

mark, Elizabeth was writing *ostensibly* to Murray, that she wanted no one to accuse Mary; that she never meant to condemn her on any accusation; that she should allow of no faults in her; and that she would endeavour to settle all differences betwixt her and her subjects, upon grounds reasonable and honourable to both. And all the while, too, Elizabeth was promising Mary herself to restore her, to make her subjects submit to her, force them to repair her wrongs, and oblige them to accept her clemency. In so much stronger light still does the hypocrisy of Elizabeth appear, at the very commencement of this business.

Her commissioners afterwards applied these very words in their commission, to the resolution of the very same doubt; when it was alleged again by the rebels. They even applied them, as resolving the doubt in the very same manner. Murray declared to them at York, they tell us, that he and his associates “were desirous to understand, if in this action they shall prove all things directly, wherewith they maye and do burden the Quene, their soveraigne’s mother; how they maye be assured to be free and without daunger of the said Quene’s displeasure, if she should be restored to her former estate: to whome it was saide by the Quene’s Majestie’s commissioners, that as in few wordes her Highnes had delivered *them* her pleasure therein, so wolde *they* in few wordes deliver the same unto *them*; which was, that indede her Majestie’s desire hath always bene from the beginning, that the said Quene might be founde
“ free,

“ free, specially from the crime of her husband’s
“ murder; nevertheless, if her Majestie shall
“ fynde to be playnelye and manifestly proved
“ (whereof she wolde be verie forie), that the said
“ Quene of Scottes was the devisor and procurer
“ of that murder, or otherwise was giltye thereof;
“ SURELY HER MAJESTIE WOLDE THINKE
“ HER UNWORTHY OF A KINGDOME, and
“ WOLDE NOT STAINE HER OWNE CONSCIENCE
“ in mayntenance of such a detestable wicked-
“ nefs, BY RESTORING HER TO A KINGDOME.
“ Then the regent [Murray] opened the cause,
“ why he moved this question: declaring, that
“ it was not only put out and published in Scot-
“ land, but even now in this citie; that either
“ she should be amplie restored, or otherwise by
“ some degrees restored and sent home amongs
“ them; and do not let to saye, that THEY HAVE
“ THE QUENE’S MAJESTIE’S PROMES TO SHEW
“ IN WRITINGE, to confirme the same. It was
“ answered thereunto by the Quene’s Majestie’s
“ commissioners, that it weare by them to be
“ considered, from whence those wordes came;
“ if from their adverse partie, who can let them
“ speak what themselves will devise? But, surely,
“ either from HER MAJESTIE, or any by [of]
“ her commysioners, *they could not affirme the*
“ *same: for* when THEIR LETTRES, conteyninge
“ the doubt before by them moved, weare deli-
“ vered to the Quene’s Majestie’s handes; they
“ knew that immediately her Highnes did forth-
“ with depeche her answer thereunto, IN SORTE
“ AS (if nothings had byn now spoken by us,
VOL. I. F “ her

“her Grace’s commyffioners) IT MIGHT HAVE
“SATISFIED THAT DOUBT AND QUESTION*.”

Elizabeth therefore answered their doubt before, exactly as her instructions to her commissioners spoke, and exactly as her commissioners spoke from those instructions to the rebels; that she would *not* restore Mary to her crown, if the rebels could prove her guilty of murder: though she had been assuring those rebels, that she would allow *no* faults in Mary; and though she had been promising Mary herself, that she *would* restore her. And as the commissioners informed Elizabeth herself, of the written promise that was ready to be shewn from Elizabeth, for the restoration of Mary; of their denial of it; and of their assurance in the language of her letter to the rebels, and of her instructions to them her commissioners, that Mary would *not* be restored if proved guilty; the commissioners unwittingly exhibit the hypocrisy of Elizabeth, in a still stronger light than ever.

Murray must have seen the hypocrisy plainly himself, from the ostensible and the real answer of Elizabeth compared together. He must have seen it much more plainly, from the writing which was ready to be produced, with Elizabeth’s promise to Mary in it. But he was too much an hypocrite himself, to be offended with the duplicity of a sister in hypocrisy. He was only acting hitherto, in order to please some of his honest adherents. He had a much deeper game

* Goodall, ii. 126—127.

to play for himself, as I shall soon shew. *This* proves the message by Middlemore, and the application to the commissioners, to have been calculated merely for others. And these others were now called upon by no less a bribe, than the promise of Murray's continuance in the royalty under the name of regent, and consequently of their own continuance in places of power and profit under him; to charge the Queen boldly with the murder of her husband, to screw up their invention for evidences to the highest pitch, and to produce them confidently before the court.

But, as I have intimated already, neither Murray nor Elizabeth would rest the cause merely upon this. They must, both of them, go much farther to answer their respective purposes. Accordingly Murray in the address before, which was to be reported to Elizabeth, and which, as we have already seen, was actually reported to her, spoke additionally thus. "Further," he says, "it may be, that sic [such] LETTERIS as
 " we heif of the Quene, our Soverane Lordis
 " moder, that sufficientlie in our opinion preivis
 " hir consenting to the murthure of the King hir
 " lauchfull husband; *shall be callit in doubt be the*
 " *juges*, to be constitute for examinatioun and
 " trial of the caus, whether *they may stand or fall*,
 " *pruif or not*: thairfoir, sen our fervand Mr.
 " Jhone Wode hes the COPIES of the samin
 " letteris TRANSLATIT in our language, we
 " wald *earnestly* desyre, that the saidis COPIES
 " may be *considerit be the juges*;—that they may
 " resolve us this far, IN CAIS THE PRINCIPAL

“AGRIE WITH THE COPIE, that THEN WE
 “PRUIF THE CAUS INDEED: for when we have
 “manifested and schawin all, and zet [yet] fall
 “haif na ASSURANCE that IT WE SEND fall SA-
 “TISFIE FOR PROBATIOUN, for *quhat purpois sal*
 “*we ather accuse or take care how to pruiif**.”

Thus had Murray the effrontery to propose to Elizabeth, that her commissioners, which were to be appointed, should receive as evidence of the highest crimes in Mary, a set of LETTERS pretended to be written by her; should peruse them over, *before* they were produced as evidence; peruse only *copies*, and even only *translations* of them; and then assure him, whether they would admit them as full evidence of guilt, NOT if *the originals appeared to be written in her own hand*, BUT if *the originals agreed with the copies*.

This was such a proposal, as required no refinements of religion, and asked no delicacies of honour, to spurn at it with contempt. A common share of religion or of honour, must have rejected it with scorn. Only the lowest strain of probity, which works in the breast of the vulgar; only the modesty, that adheres to a young sinner; and only the shame, that silently pulls the heart-strings of all but abandoned vice; would have considered the proposal as an insult, and dismissed it with disdain. But did Elizabeth do so? In that ostensible paper which I have mentioned before, she pretended to do so. There we find the following question and answer. *Quest.* “Why-

* Goodall, ii. 75—76.

“ther,

“ther, if the originals shall accord with the
 “copys of the wrytings produced to charge the
 “Quene of Scots, the proof shall be thought
 “sufficient?” *Ans.* “No proves can be taken
 “for sufficient, without hearyng of both par-
 “tyes*.” This was speaking honestly. But I
 have so clearly convicted this paper of false-
 hood already, and it shews us so plainly its own
 hypocrisy; that we cannot be imposed upon by
 it. Whether Elizabeth *did* reject this proposal
 of Murray’s, let FACTS tell. *They* cannot lie,
They cannot deceive us. Let, particularly, the
 conduct of her commissioners speak at large, here-
 after. And let her own conduct speak briefly at
 present. Murray had plainly intimated, that un-
 less this proposal was agreed to, he would not
 come forward with his evidence. “When we
 “haif manifestit and schawin all,” he says, “and
 “zet fall haif na assurance, that it we send fall
 “fatisfie for probatioun; *for quhat purpos sall we*
 “*ather accuse, or take care how to pruiſ!*” Eli-
 zabeth, therefore, must have now seen the writ-
 ings to be spurious, if she ever believed them to
 be genuine; and have now known the man to
 be a villain of the first magnitude, if she ever
 thought any better of him. Yet she *still proceed-*
ed in the business; she still encouraged the man to
come forward with his accusations; and still per-
sisted in calling for the writings.

Murray, indeed, must have long trafficked in
 villainy, as he had long maintained a connection,

* Goodall, ii. 89.

with her; before he could have risen to such a pitch of familiarity, with the evil spirit within her, as to *think* of making her such an overture. But he knew her too well, to be afraid of any virtuous resentment from her. Associates in enormity always pay that compliment to goodness, to have the strongest contempt for one another. He saw her eagerness to blast the character of Mary. She would comply with any proposals, however flagitious, that ministered to her purposes. And her commissioners acted nearly, as Murray had required they should act*.

§ II.

THE commissioners met Murray and some of his party at York, in the month of October following. They then give this account of Murray's proceedings and their own, there. "The
" said Erle," they say, "hath been content
" PRIVATLIE to shew us such matter, as they
" have to condempne the Queen of Scottes, of

* For the intimacy between Elizabeth and Murray, we need only appeal to Fenelon, the French embassadour at her court; who describes her behaviour, when she heard of Murray's sudden death, about eighteen or nineteen months afterward. "It is almost incredible to what excess the Queen
" of England was transported with grief on this occasion;
" she *shut herself up in her chamber, weeping and lamenting, she*
" *had lost the best and most serviceable friend she had in the*
" *world,* for the maintenance of herself and realm in quiet;
" and she grew so *melancholy* upon it, that Leicester was
" forced to tell her, she did an injury to her dignity in
" *shewing, that she thought her own safety and that of her realm*
" *depended upon one man alone*" (Fenelon, Dep. 84, Carte
iii. 493).

" the

“ the murder of her husband : and so they sent
 “ unto us the Lord of Lethingtoun, James Mak-
 “ gill, and Mr. George Boqwhannan, and ano-
 “ ther, being a Lord of the Session ; which in
 “ PRIVATE and SECRET conference with us, NOT
 “ as COMMISSIONERS, as they *protested*, but for
 “ our better instruction, shewed unto us some
 “ LETTERS*.” That the commissioners should
 have

* Appendix, No. v. One of the persons sent to shew the letters, is said by the commissioners to have been “ a Lord of the Session.” This Mr. Goodall affirms to have been “ John Wood.” ii. 140. So also does Mr. Tytler, 60, edit. 1st. and Dr. Stuart, i. 329, edit. in octavo. And both Crawford, 90, edit. 1st. and Melvill, 93, edit. 1st. represent Wood to have been at York with the party. But this is all a mistake, I apprehend. Wood was at this time agent to Murray in London. There he was stationed in the month of June preceding ; as Elizabeth mentions him to have been in London on June the 8th, as Murray notes him to be still there on June the 22nd, and as the latter says particularly, “ we have already sent,” not *by*, as the words seem to have been carelessly read by several of our writers, but “ unto our fervand Mr. Jhone Wode” the letters. Appendix, No. iii. See also Anderson, iv. part 1st. 17. And the persons sent by Murray to the English commissioners, were undoubtedly the *assistants* to him and the rebel commissioners. These were, as an authentick paper assures us, “ the Laird of Lethingtoun, “ James Macgill, Henry Balnavys, the Laird of Lochlevin, “ Mr. George Boqwhannan, Mr. David Lyndefay.” Goodall, ii. 109. Wood was not among them. It was also one, say the commissioners above, who was “ a lord of the session.” Such was Wood, says Mr. Tytler, *ibid.* But if Wood was ever a lord of the session, which I doubt, he was not one then, I apprehend. Even if he was, he was certainly not a lord of the session, and an assistant to the commissioners too. Yet both characters must unite in our present personage.

have *suffered* any papers, and papers of such a criminating nature, and especially such as went to the very heart and soul of their commission, to be brought before them in a *clandestine* manner; was a most astonishing act of absurdity and injustice. But Murray had required it before. Elizabeth must therefore HAVE PRIVATELY COMMANDED IT now. She accordingly, in her immediate reply to this account of their conduct, passes not the slightest censure, upon such a gross and palpable violation of decency. She even intimates her approbation of it. “We have of late,” she says, “received your several letters, with all such other matters contained in sundry writings, as by your said letters hath been mentioned,” meaning some extracts and accounts of Murray’s letters, sent by them to Elizabeth; “upon consideration whereof, we have found such difficulties how to make a certain resolute answer unto yow, as we are rather moved to have further advice of others of our counsell, now absent, and likewise of *you ther*; wherefore we are desirous, to have some understanding of *your opinions* *.” And the requisition of Murray, the conduct of the commissioners, and the reply of Elizabeth, are all so many rays uniting in one point.

Both actually united in Mr. James Macgill and Mr. Henry Balnavys. Mr. Tytler, 210, allows both to have been lords of session. Keith, 375, Jebb, ii. 236, Crawford, 90, and Buchanan, Hist. xix. 372, Ruddiman, 1, confirm the point. And therefore Balnavys was the man.

* Goodall, ii. 170.

But

But the commissioners go on thus : “ We have
 “ noted to your Majestie the chiefe and—speciall
 “ points of the said letters, written, as they say,
 “ with her own hand ; to the intent it may please
 “ your Majestie to consider of them, and so to
 “ judge whether the same be sufficient to con-
 “ vince [convict] her, of the detestable crime of
 “ the murder of her husband ; which *in our opi-*
 “ *nions and consciences*, if the said letters be writ-
 “ ten with her own hand, is very hard to be
 “ avoided *.” This extra-judicial judgment of
 the commissioners, so contrary to reason and com-
 mon sense, was another particular in Murray’s re-
 quisitions. He required it to be done. And it
 was ACTUALLY DONE. By this means, evi-
 dences were produced clandestinely to the com-
 missioners. These were received by them, just
 as if they had been regularly presented in open
 court. Large accounts are drawn up of them.
 Larger extracts are made from them. Both
 are transmitted to Elizabeth and her council.
 The commissioners declare openly to both, that
 they have already prejudged her cause. And,
 all the while, Mary and her commissioners are to-
 tally ignorant of the whole transaction ; and are
 preparing to enter upon a trial, that is in a great
 measure determined against them already †.

The only doubt expressed by the commis-
 sioners,

* Appendix, No. v.

† Mary’s commissioners, however, came soon to know, that
 “ Murray and his party had privily uttered to her Majestie’s
 “ commissioners, *all that they were able to alleadge against her*”
 (Goodall, ii. 159—160). But they little suspected all, that the
 commissioners had done in the business.

sioners, is this, Whether the letters were her own hand-writing. But how did they act upon this, the capital point of the whole? They shall tell us themselves. “These men heare,” they say, “do constantly AFFIRM the said letters, which they produce of her own hand, to be her own hand indede; and do *offer* to SWEAR and TAKE THEIR OATHS, thereupon*.” They never compared the produced writings, that pretended to be of her hand, with any other writings, that were acknowledged to be so. They much less called in the commissioners of Mary, to assist them in the collation. They rested all upon the affirmation of the producers, and upon the credit of their offered oaths. And they were precluded from communicating, even the *contents* of them to Mary’s commissioners; by the artful mode in which they had been exhibited to them, not as commissioners, but as private gentlemen.

In such a manner, was the first part of the trial conducted; with a very near conformity to the original requisitions of Murray, and to the great disgrace of Elizabeth and her commissioners. These acted in all, no doubt, under the private directions of her. And Murray was only doing in

* Appendix, No. v. Dr. Robertson with a *simplicity* of belief, which is very extraordinary in itself, and is peculiarly so in a man of his good sense and judiciousness, mentions as one argument against Mary; that Murray and his associates affirmed the letters to be genuine. Hist. ii. Appendix, Diff. 21. So, good St. Francis, when one night he spied by accident a man and a woman very immodestly employed in a corner, believed them to be engaged in a work of Christian love, and thanked Heaven for the sight.

in all, what he and she had already concerted should be done. Hence Murray proposed to put them clandestinely in possession of his papers; and they agreed to peruse them clandestinely. Hence they thought themselves at liberty as commissioners, though they were exhibited to them as private gentlemen, to communicate a long account of them to Elizabeth, but not to give any to Mary; and to make large extracts from them, with their own opinions occasionally intimated as they went along. And hence they spoke out their opinion pretty plainly at last, upon the whole. “These men,” they say, “do offer to swear and
 “take their oaths thereupon, *the matteir conteyned*
 “*in them being such, as could hardly be invented*
 “*or devised by any other than by herselfe;* for
 “that they discourse of some things, *which were*
 “*unknownen to anie other than to herself and Both-*
 “*well:* and as it is hard to counterfeit so manie,
 “so the matter of them, and the *manner how these*
 “*men came by them,* is such; as it seemeth that
 “God, in whose sight murder and bludshed of
 “the innocent is abhommable [abominable],
 “*would not permit the same to be hid or con-*
 “*cealed*.*” They thus condemn the Queen, of the murder charged upon her; in a formal dispatch to Elizabeth; and upon letters, unauthenticated by the producers, uncollated by themselves, uncommunicated to her and her commissioners. They condemn her, upon the *offer* of oaths to their genuineness, *from the very producers themselves;* and upon certain particulars in them, which they

* Appendix, No. v.

say were unknown to all except her and Bothwell ; but which they could only have heard to have been so, *from the very producers themselves*. And they condemn her upon the manner, in which the letters came into the hands of the producers ; which they affirm to have been a signal mark, of God's interposel to punish murder and bloodshed in her ; but which they must equally have heard, *from the very producers themselves*. Such was the astonishing dishonesty, with which the commissioners acted towards her in this outset of the business ! Yet Elizabeth *approved of all*. She liked their proceedings. She liked them so well, that she wanted to have their further advice upon the subject ; and that she continued them as commissioners, when she adjourned the trial to London.

§ III.

THE commissioners, however, were not entrusted with *all* the schemes of Elizabeth in this matter. They consisted of the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Suffex, and Sir Ralph Sadler. Some of these were too honourable for such a confidence. But one of them no doubt, and Sir Ralph Sadler assuredly *, had his private instructions for managing

* Buchanan, Hist. xix. 372, says of Lord Surry and Sir Ralph, "*hic ab omni diffidii veneno purus*," having no taint of Norfolk's enmity to Murray, "*ille (ut vulgo creditum est) in partes Havarti proclivis*." Mary also told Bishop Lesley, as Lesley says, that "she trusted I wold find the "*juges favorable, principalie the Duke of Norfolke, who was*
" first

managing the business, just as it was managed. And when Murray exhibited his papers clandestinely to them, he did it, as I have already hinted, merely in a private concert with her and this commissioner. He did it, as they tell us themselves, “to the intent, they [Murray, &c.] wolde know
 “of us, *how your Majestie* understanding the same,
 “*wolde judge of the sufficiencie of the matter*; and
 “whether, in your Majestie’s opinion, *the same*
 “*will extend to condempne the Queen of Scottes, of*
 “*the said murder**.” They accordingly ask her opinion. “We are,” they say to her, “most
 “humble beseaching your Majestie, that it may
 “please the same to advertise us, of your opinion
 “and judgement therein †.” But had Elizabeth never seen the letters before? She certainly had. Copies of them had been sent to London by Murray, as I have shewn already, above four months before. These Murray had even offered by his address of the 22d of June, to communicate to Elizabeth, for the consideration of the commissioners that she *was* to appoint. She did

“first in commission; and doubted not bot Therle Suffex
 “wold be rewled by him, as his tender freind; and Sir
 “Rauph Sadler wold not ganestand their advyses” (Murdin, 52). See also Goodall, ii. 171 and 179, Robertson, ii. 345, and Haynes, 272, for Sir Ralph. Crawford’s Memoirs accordingly say, that the commissioners had “private instructions” directly “against” their publick, p. 91. And we actually find Sir Ralph himself, united in a commission with the Earl of Northumberland and Sir James Crofts in 1559, but furnished with “*private instructions of importance*.” Preface, p. xv. to Sir Ralph Sadler’s Letters.

* Appendix, No. v.

† Ibid, *ibid*.

not appoint them, till the 20th of September following *. But could Elizabeth refrain all this time from looking into the letters, from feeding her love of scandal against Mary, and from inspecting the ground-work of all her future operations against her? Certainly she could not. She saw the letters. She knew them, as well before the commissioners imparted their contents to her, as she did afterwards. And she even contrived a method, of COMMUNICATING THE LETTERS TO THEM UNPERCEIVED. Murray had desired of Elizabeth, to have them laid before her commissioners, previously to their sitting in judgment upon them; and to have their private opinion before-hand, concerning their competency or incompetency to prove his allegations. THIS WAS NOW DONE. The papers were *offered* to be laid before them, by Murray. The secret emissary of Elizabeth among them, probably, influenced them to admit the offer. The papers were produced. The commissioners perused, abstracted, and extracted from them. And they then communicated *their opinions* on the whole, to Elizabeth; and through her, no doubt, to Murray.

In this artful manner, does Elizabeth appear to have acted towards her own commissioners. Her whole life, was nothing but one scene of artifice and dishonesty. Her duplicity upon the present occasion is evidenced, by the requisitions of Murray at first, and by the conduct of her commissioners afterwards. These are the two parts of a tally. Who can doubt their relation?

* Goodall, ii. 97.

Yet though the commissioners, from the plain influence of some emissary of Elizabeth's among them, and from the violent force of their own credulity, had acted with a gross dishonesty to Mary; Elizabeth saw, even from this very dispatch, that they would not do all which she wanted them to do. Murray had required in addition to all the rest, and indeed as the grand support of all; that the papers should be admitted for evidences, without any inquiry into their handwriting. But Elizabeth now found from the complexion of their dispatches, marked as they strongly were with all the features of a hasty faith, a rash judgment, and a practising insidiousness; that they would come at last to the point, which should have been the first in the process of their inquiry. They had begun their accounts of the writings produced, with those proper guards of doubt, "as they say," and "as it is said." These they had sometimes dropt, in the intemperate rising of their spirits upon Mary's presumed guilt. But they had again recurred to them. And they had at last concluded their dispatch, with mentioning the letters to be "written, AS THEY SAY, "with her own hand;" and with intimating their opinion of her guilt, "IF the said letters be written with her own hand *." The next step therefore must have been, to have had the letters produced formally before the commissioners; and then to have had their authenticity examined. This was what Elizabeth never meant to be

* Appendix, No. v.

done. Yet it must immediately be done, if the present commissioners went on. And Elizabeth, therefore, put an instant end to their commission.

This commission had been issued at first, in order “to pronounce in the cause of the murder.” The commissioners themselves say as much, in a formal answer to some questions asked by Murray concerning their authority. “They take their commission to be so ample,” they say, “as by the same they may well enter and proceed to that controverſie *.” And any one who knows the character of Elizabeth, and considers the end of all her proceedings, must know that this was the great and ruling object of the whole. Yet into this the commissioners never entered. They sat only seven days, before their grand dispatch above. The first four of these were spent, in the necessary preliminaries of the work. On the fifth, being the 8th day of October, the commissioners of Mary presented their complaint against her rebels. Murray, instead of replying, wanted previously to be assured, exactly in the style of his former requisitions to Elizabeth: “if in this action they shall prove all things directly, where- with they may and do burthen the Quene, their soveraigne’s moder; how they may be assured to be free, and without daunger of the said Quene’s displeasure *.” The next day, being the 9th of October, they put in some questions in writing to the same purport. These were answered instantly by the commissioners. But Murray was not satis-

* Goodall, ii. 131.

† Ibid. 126.

fied with their answer. He would have one from Elizabeth herself. And the writing to Elizabeth, and the waiting for her answer, necessarily produced a suspension of business for some days. *In this state of suspension* it was, that Murray offered and proceeded to present his papers clandestinely to the commissioners. The delay, therefore, was created artfully for the purpose. On the 9th of October, Murray put in his written questions. On the 9th of October, the commissioners sent up to Elizabeth for her answers to them. On the 10th, Murray put in that reply to Mary's complaint, which he had deferred before. And, *in the afternoon of that very day*, he communicated his evidences of the murder privately to the commissioners *. These evidences he had utterly refused to produce before. Only the very day before, in his paper of questions to the commissioners, he had said thus: "The resolution of
 " these articlis is sa necessary for us, and of sa
 " great importance, that we can na ways enter to
 " the accusatioun or tryal of the murther, before
 " we be fully answerit thairin †." Yet the very next day, and when all accusation was formally superseded for a time, he could privately enter into that accusation, and even lay his evidences for it privately before them.

This is such a manœuvre in management, as shews plainly the publick accusation to have been

* Goodall, ii. 108—iii, 123, 126—127, 130—133, 139, and 140.

† Ibid. i. 131.

superfeded, IN ORDER to give room for preferring the private one; for the perusal of the papers by the commissioners; for transmitting an account of them to Elizabeth; and for Elizabeth to see their opinions concerning them, to view the impressions which these had made upon them, and to observe whether they would go all the lengths, which it was requisite for her purposes they should go. She found upon the trial, they would not. She therefore made no reply to Murray's doubts. These wanted no resolution at present. The dispatch concerning them must have reached her, *two days* before the other concerning the letters. Yet she wrote no answer to it. This appeared strange at the very time. "Because I am advertised from York," says Sir Francis Knollys, "that hyr Majestie *doth betherto stay* the answering of the artykles of my lord of Murraye and his partie; therefore," &c*. These pressed for an immediate answer. The whole business of the *accusation*, was prevented from *beginning* to move. And had she not been in the secret of Murray's management, she must have answered them immediately. But, by being in the secret, she knew no answer was required. She expected another dispatch, with an account of the letters. It arrived. It was very much what she wished. But it was not all that she wanted. She was, says in express terms the sagacious author of the memoirs published by Crawford, "but indifferently pleased with what had past †." And for this

* Goodall, ii. 160.

† P. 112.

reason,

reason, though the commissioners were yet only at the very entrance of the business, had yet received only one paper from each side, and these could necessarily be only formal and general, the mere ground-work of their future proceedings; she dissolved their commission at once.

She could not have received their dispatch concerning the letters, before the 14th or 15th of October; and on the 16th she sent word of her intention, to break up the commission directly*. She broke it up accordingly. She issued out a new commission. To the former three she ADDED FIVE OTHERS, Sir Nicholas Bacon, the Earls of Arundel and Leicester, Lord Clinton, and Sir William Cecil. She did this, say the cotemporary memoirs of Crawford, “because she had suspected Norfolk, and would balance his interest;” because she would balance his own voice, and his influence over his relation, the Earl of Suffex, in his. And she ordered them to sit, not at York, but at WESTMINSTER; that they might be more immediately under her own inspection and influence †.

§ IV.

THE commissioners met accordingly at Westminster, in the end of November following. There the first act of business done by them, was to resolve the doubts of Murray. To these, the

* Goodall, ii. 134, 139, and 170.

† Goodall, ii. 189—191; Crawford, 112; and Buchanan, Hist. xix. 372.

commissioners at York had thus replied before ; that, “ as her Majestic wold not thinke her
 “ [Mary] worthie of a kingdom, if she weare
 “ convinced [convicted] of that horrible crime,”
 murder, “ so wold [she] not seke to restore her
 “ to a kingdome*.” But Murray would not
 be satisfied with this. He had risen in his de-
 mands, since the original stipulation. In pro-
 portion as he saw her eagerness, to blast the cha-
 racter of Mary ; he drew back from the work, in
 order to enhance the value of it. He would
 now have more than he originally required, be-
 fore he gratified Elizabeth with a publick accu-
 sation. And Elizabeth, with all her address, was
 made by her resentments, a mere instrument of
 policy in his hands. He dictated the terms, on
 which he would accuse. He prescribed the man-
 ner, in which his accusation should be received.
He had the support of his usurpation in view.
She had the full indulgence of her resentments.
 Her regard for these was more violent, than even
 his zeal for that. And, in consequence of this,
 Elizabeth became a mere puppet dancing upon
 this Scotchman’s wires. He was accordingly
 gratified in his requisitions, to the full. But the
 commissioners, before they delivered the answer
 of Elizabeth to him, entered this *very necessary*
 precaution : “ That Elizabeth meaneth not,
 “ nor will, that any person do thereof interprete,
 “ that thereby the said Erle of Murray, or any
 “ with him, should be *boldened, moved, or any*

* Goodall, ii. 131—132.

“ *wife comforted*, to enter into accusation of the
 “ said Quene [Mary], for any crime or suspicion
 “ of crime *.” They then told him, as from
 Elizabeth, thus: “ If the Quene of Scotts shall
 “ be justly proved and found guilty of the murder
 “ of hir husband, *she shall be ether delivered into*
 “ *your hands*, upon good and sufficient sureties
 “ and assurances, for the safety of her life and
 “ good usage of her; or else she shall continew
 “ *kept* in England, upon the reasonable charges
 “ of the crown of Scotland, *in such sort* as nether
 “ the prince her son, nor you the Erle of Murray,
 “ nor any other, for holding part or maintaining
 “ the said prince, *shall be in any danger by her*
 “ *liberty* †.”

Thus supported by the assurances of Elizabeth, not only *not* to restore Mary if she was found guilty, as she had solemnly and unconditionally promised Mary she would do; but even to keep under perpetual captivity in England, or to give up to her bloody and murderous enemies in Scotland, the very Queen whom she had solemnly promised to restore to her throne: and thus encouraged by the préjudgment, which had already been made by the original commissioners concerning the papers: Murray was now ready to come forward with them publickly. But he must previously enter a protestation, he thought. He entered one accordingly, on the 26th of November. In this, he asserted himself and his party to have given “ sufficient testimony to the

* Goodall, ii. 200.

† Ibid. 201.

“ world, how UNWILLING THEY HAD ALLWISE
 “ BEEN to twiche the King our Sovereigne Lordis
 “ moder in honour, or to publish unto strangeris
 “ matteris tending to her perpetual infamy.”
 He also averred, “ that RATHER *than spot her*
 “ *honestie with the society of that detestibill mur-*
 “ *der*, they were content to *wink* at the shrewd
 “ reports of the world, quha blaisnit them for
 “ traitoris and rebellis.” The world, it seems,
 was composed of *blunt fellows, that would call a*
spade a spade. But “ it had bene easy for them,”
 he said, “ to have wyped away thir [these] and
 “ the like objectionis with a few wordis; gif
 “ they would have UTTERIT matter, QUIHLK
 “ THEY KEPT IN STORE FOR THE LATER
 “ CAST.” He even added, that they had so
 far “ respect” for Mary, “ zea sa far: gif that
 “ with the *perpetual exile* of any *ane* of them, or
 “ zit of a *number*, they might redeme hir honour,
 “ without danger of the King their Sovereign’s
 “ persoun and haill state; *they wald willingly ba-*
 “ *nische themselves to that end.*” And for this rea-
 son, “ before they enter farther in the ground of
 “ this matter, WHICH TO THIS HOUR THEY HAD
 “ FLED, they *protest solemnelie*; that they have na
 “ delyte to see hir dishonourit; but that they
 “ are thairto *enforcit* be hir awin pressing, and
 “ their adversaries, quha compellis them to UT-
 “ TER that most odious matter, by pressing them
 “ to cum to that answer, quhilk they knew they
 “ had just caus to mak, and *will mak in the end* *.”

* Goodall, ii. 203—206,

This protestation was a most extraordinary act of formality in Murray. An habitual hypocrisy frequently betrays itself, by exercising its powers when they are totally unnecessary, by a wanton display of its deceptions, and by an impertinent affectation of scrupulosity.

This was strikingly the case here. A protestation of such a nature as this, so solemnly false, and *known to be so by the very persons to whom it was made*, could have served no purpose whatever. It must even have hurt the cause, which it was intended to promote. It must have convinced the commissioners, that Murray and his friends were a set of abandoned wretches, who were ready to give the sanction of their solemnest assertions, to the grossest falsehoods; and who were even so habituated to lying, as to lie confidently where truth would have answered as well. These very evidences, which Murray here so unnecessarily and *solemnly* affirms, to have been “kept in store for the later cast,” and, “to this hour to have been fled” by him; had been communicated by him, to his own privy council and his own parliament, in the month of December before*; had been acknowledged by himself, in some private conversation with the Duke of Norfolk at York, to have been shewn in parliament, and “seen to many” there†; had actually been proclaimed to have been so, in such a publick and formal book as his own STATUTES, printed the very April after-

* Goodall, ii. 64 and 67.

† Robertson, ii. 397.

wards *; had been even communicated by him to Elizabeth, in the month of June succeeding; and had been at last communicated by him to the commissioners, in the month of October following. These had even drawn up a long account of them, and had even made large extracts from them, for the use of Elizabeth. And both had been laid before her privy council †; before the Lord Keeper Bacon, the Earl of Leicester, the Lord Admiral Clinton, and Sir William Cecil, among others ‡. The old commissioners at York therefore, and four out of the five new commissioners, must have known the solemn protestation, at the moment it was put in; to be notoriously false. *Murray also must know, that the commissioners must.* Yet he still presented it. There is a point of profligacy in the line of human impudence, at which the most disguised heart seems to lose all sensibility of shame, and the most designing mind seems to deprive itself of all possibility of cheating.

Murray had actually made use of the same kind of protestation BEFORE, though not with the same formality of hypocrisy, when he put the letters into the hands of the commissioners at YORK. He and his partisans, *then* too, were “loothe to
“proceede so far, as to charge the Kinge their
“Sovereigne’s mother with suche things, as
“*hitherto* they have been content rather to *hide*
“and *conceale*, than to publish and manifest to

* Goodall, Introd. i. 23.

† Ibid. ii. 170.

‡ Ibid. 172.

“ the worlde to her infamie and dishonour; in
 “ respect that she was the Kinge their Sovereigne’s
 “ mother *.” Yet they *did* “ publish and mani-
 “ fest” to the commissioners, the proofs of “ her
 “ infamie and dishonour.” But they also made
 the same sort of protestation BEFORE THIS, even
 when they *first* produced the letters. “ Reveling
 “ of the trewth,” they say in their privy council
 on the 4th of December, 1567, “ and grund of
 “ the haill matter fra the beginninge plainlie and
 “ uprichtlie—(in sa far as the manifestation theirol
 “ maie tend to the dishonor or defestimation of
 “ the Quene) *they air maist loith to entre in*; for
 “ that luif they beare unto hir person,—and for
 “ the reverence of his Majestie, whais moder
 “ she is †.” And still they *did* enter into it. On
 the 4th of December, 1567, they were loth to
 make a disclosure of the letters, because of the
 infamy which it would throw upon the Queen.
 They make it, however, in privy council. They
 make it in parliament, a few days afterwards.
 But in the October following they take up the
 same cant of candour, as if they had done nei-
 ther; and yet do it a third time. And then, in
 the November following, they take up the same
 cant again, as if they had never done at all, what
 they had now done no less than three times before;
 and repeat it again for the fourth time. Never,
 never, I hope, for the honour of human nature,
 did hypocrisy before or since draw so long and so
 large a train of imposture after it, as it here does.

* Goodall, ii. 136,

† Appendix, No. i.

But

But Murray stood not alone in the infamy of lying, at this stage of the business. Elizabeth was his rival, in this and in all flagitioufness. It is mournfully curious indeed to observe, what a ready recourse the generality of men and women have to lying. A lie is considered by them as a kind auxiliary, ever willing to come at the call, and to fight their battles for them. But women, I speak it with great respect for the sex, are ordinarily more apt to take refuge in lies than men. Bred up in some necessary habits of dissimulation; and urged by the sense of their weakness, to make up in cunning what they want in strength; they are certainly more prone to the little arts of evasion, than men. Yet still the well-educated and the well-principled part of that sex, is to the full as much superiour to these arts, as the same part of our own. And for bold and impudent untruths, for lies told with grave deliberation, vouched with cool confidence, and supported by the respect due to authority; for these darling flights of falsehood, their natural delicacy of temper, which keeps them from so many improprieties in life, keeps them also from this. Such flights are reserved for the stronger wings of men. They are too masculine exercises in profligacy, to suit even the profligate of woman-kind. Elizabeth, however, was profligate enough for them. She had the boldness of the worst of our sex, superadded to the evasiveness of the worst of her own. She therefore loved to try her strength, in this masculine exercise of profligacy. She peculiarly did so, on the present occasion.

And

And at the commencement of the second conference, and on the 4th of December, she told the commissioners of Mary thus; Murray, immediately after his protestation, having adduced his charge of murder against Mary *. Concerning this charge from the party, she said, I cannot suffer Mary “to cum hier to my presence, *unto* “ [until] *the time I may understand*, HOW THAY “ WILL PRUIFF, and QUHAT THAY HAVE FOR “ THAME TO VERIFIE THEIR ANSWER;” and “ thairfoir I will send for thame, and ENQUYRE “ THAME thair of; for I think it verie reffonabill “ that,” &c.: “ but to determine any time, *be-* “ *fore* I understand HOW THAY WILL VERIFIE “ THAIR ALLEGATIOUN; I am not as zit re- “ solvit.” To this the commissioners answered. And Elizabeth replied thus: “ for the MAIR fa- “ tisfactioun of HIRSELF, and for thair mistrefs’s “ weill, she WALD KNOW QUHAT THAY HAD “ to propone sic thing contrair [to] thair So- “ verane, and HOW THAY MIGHT PRUIF THE “ SAMIN †.”

The reader, who remembers the account that I have already given, of the evidences against Mary; will be amazed, at these declarations from the lips of Elizabeth. She had seen the letters in June preceding. She had received a long account of them, and large extracts from them, in October afterwards. She must therefore have known them thoroughly, at present. Yet she now steps forward with all the confidence of truth, to

* Goodall, ii. 206—207.

† Ibid. 222.

tell the commissioners of Mary, That she does *not* know any thing concerning them. She does not yet understand, she affirms, *how* they mean to prove their preferred accusation, or *what* evidences they design to produce. This is such an absolute falsehood, told so deliberately, so repeatedly, and so solemnly ; that one wonders how the duplicity of *any* woman, or the effrontery of *any* man, even when united together, could ever be great enough to speak it.

But the hardness of falsifying in Elizabeth, appears much stronger from the consideration ; that she so formally spoke this striking untruth, *in the presence of those very nobles who knew it to be one*. She spoke it in the presence of that very Duke of Norfolk, Earl of Suffex, and Sir Ralph Sadler, who had sent her the long account, and made the large extracts for her. She also spoke it in the presence of that very Lord Keeper, Lord Steward, Lord Admiral, Lord Chamberlain, Earl of Leicester, and Sir William Cecil ; who were then the privy council attending upon her, and to whom she then communicated this account and those extracts *. In the hearing of all these, who all knew what she said to be false, *and whom she also knew to know it*, did Elizabeth assert this gross and palpable falsehood ; assert it with the authority of majesty, in the presence of her privy council, and to the ambassadors of a crowned head. So exceedingly alike in artifice and in falsehood, were Elizabeth and Murray !

* Goddall, ii. 221, 179, 170, and 223.

So very difficult is it to say on the comparison, whether the *man* or the *woman* was the most confident falsifier! And to such an astonishing height, in the scale even of *vulgar* effrontery; did the spirits of them both very readily mount up, on the slightest occasion that offered!

But, on Murray's presenting his charge to the commissioners of Elizabeth, Mary's immediately required, that their mistress should be permitted, to come up to London from her confinement in the country; and to appear before Elizabeth, "hir haill nobilitie, and als [also] in presence of
" the ambassadours of forraign countries; for mair
" trew declaratioun of hir innocence, and satis-
" factioun of the Quenis Majestie of this realme,
" hir nobilitie, and all Christiane princes*." This was such a requisition, so proper, bold, and challenging; that justice could never refuse, and honour could never delay, to grant it. Yet Elizabeth delayed, and Elizabeth refused. She begged the interval of a day to consider of it †. She then would *not* grant of it. "Quhair ze
" desire," she says, "that zour Soverane shalld
" cum to my presence; it may not weil stand
" with hir honour, nor zit with myne, that scho
" should be travellit to com hier to my presence,
" unto the time I may understand how thay will
" pruiſſe," &c. ‡ She *already* knew, how they meant to prove their charge. She had even seen their proofs. This, therefore, was only a pre-

* Goodall, ii. 217—218 and 220. † Ibid. 221.

‡ Ibid. 221—222.

tence for a refusal. Yet, as Elizabeth adds, “I
 “ think it verie reſſonabill, that ſcho ſuld be heard
 “ in her awin caus, being ſo weightie; but to
 “ determine quhom beſoir, quhen, and quhair,
 “ ony time *before* I underſtand how thay will
 “ verifie their allegatioun, I am not as zit re-
 “ ſolvit*.”

Thus did Elizabeth ſtill continue to found her denial of juſtice, upon the ground of a known falſehood. But ſhe muſt have been particularly averſe to the propoſition, of hearing Mary in her own defence before all the nobility of England, and before all the ambaffadours of foreign powers. Their preſence would be an infurmountable bar to her deſigns. Nor did ſhe even chooſe to hear Mary at all. She rather choſe to keep her at a diſtance, while her *more honourable* rebels were allowed a free acceſs to the court; to break down her ſpirits by confinement; to tarniſh her reputation by invited charges; and to be at once her betrayer, accuſer, and judge. Nothing leſs than this, could have ſuited the purpoſes of Elizabeth. Yet even *ſhe* could not *poſitively* reſuſe ſuch a requeſt. She owned it to be “a verie reſſonabill” one †. She promiſed to grant it hereafter. But ſhe *muſt firſt bear the evidences of the accuſation againſt her*. Why muſt ſhe? She *choſe it*. “Stat
 “ pro ratione voluntas.” Yet had ſhe *not* heard

* Goodall, ii. 222.

† Yet Mr. Hume, *more bigotted to Elizabeth's ſchemes than Elizabeth herſelf*, pronounces it *unreaſonable*. Hiſt. v. 143. Edit. 1767.

them before? She certainly had. She had even *seen* them.

Did Elizabeth, however, hear Mary *afterwards* in her own defence, before the nobility and embassadours? No! Did she *afterwards* hear her, before any selected number of her own obedient ministers in privy council? No! Did she *afterwards* hear her, before any other persons? No! *She never heard her at all.* When she was *accused*, she would not admit her to her presence, *till* she had seen the evidences of the accusation, which indeed she had already seen before. And when she *had* seen them again, then, then Mary was *unworthy* to be admitted into her presence. This is such a strain of shuffling and deceit, as must amaze a man of honour to hear of. Yet it is very true. “As for her coming to his presence,” Elizabeth *then* said, “considering at the first when she came into this realme, his Majesty could not fynd it THAN agreeable to her honor,—being defamed only by common report; *much less could she now think it either mete or honourable for him to come to his presence, considering the multitude of matters and presumptions now lately produced against him, such as indede greved his Majesty to think of*.*” Elizabeth, on the 4th of December, thought it very reasonable, she should be heard in her own defence. Elizabeth, on the 16th of the same month, thought it very unreasonable. She had considered, that she would not

* Goodall, ii. 264.

admit her into her presence when she *first* came to England, and when she was accused only by common report. But she had forgotten, that even *then* Mary had been accused by much more than common report, even in form before Murray's privy council and Murray's parliament. She had also forgotten, that *since* her coming into England, even since she had been accused in form *again* before the commissioners, she had thought it very reasonable she should be admitted. And she now pretended to grieve over the evidences produced: when she had said after she had seen them, that she did not believe the accusation grounded upon them; and when she had peculiarly caused them to be produced, at present*.

This

* Goodall, ii. 221. "I culd nevir beleive, nor zit will, "that evir scho did consent thairto." "Fenelon's dispatches," says Mr. Carte, iii. 477, "for some months are filled with "the repeated professions of the Queen of England [De- "peche Jan. 20], that *she did not believe any part of what was "alledged against her good sister.*" Camden also says of Elizabeth, that "for the letters" &c. she "gave little credit to "them, though there were between them a womanish emula- "tion," &c. Transf. 117, Orig. i. 144—145. Melvill adds, that "she was glad of the Queen's dishonour, but in her "mind *she detested the Regent and all his company, and would "notice him no more,*" 97. And Crawford's Memoirs subjoin to the whole, that the calumnies "found but *little credit* with "the Queen of England, or her commissioners;" that particularly "she was too wise not to look upon him," Murray, "as the *worst of men*, who at once defamed his sister, his "Queen, the mother of his Prince, and *one whom in his con- "science he could not but believe innocent;*" and that "indeed, "as the effect of that reflection, he met with no more than in- "different entertainment at the court of England, and might "have

This is such a frightful picture of hypocrisy, that it hurts my honest feelings, even to hold it up to the publick. It is so dreadfully finished in every part, that we can see nothing but one uniform view of hypocrisy on every side. Every turn of countenance in the figures, every movement of the body in them, the whole of their drapery and disposition, all bespeak the foulest hypocrisy. Yet this is only the fore-ground of the piece. We have still more behind.

On Mary's commissioners requiring permission for Mary, to come up and defend herself; Elizabeth thought it expedient, to present another scene of equivocation to the world. "As for the Quene coming in person to her Majestie," she said,—“she concluded it to be best for the said Quene, that the said accusers should be ROUNDLY CHARGED AND REPROVED HEREIN*.” She meant, she added, “to charge the Earl of Murray, as reason was, and to REPREHEND AND IMPUGN THE ACCUSATION BY ALL GOOD MEANS, IN THE FAVOUR OF THE SAID QUENE OF SCOTTES†.” So she promised. But how did she act? *Did* she “roundly charge and reprove” Murray and his accomplices? *Did* she “reprehend and impugn

“have found by experience, that though princes for interest may sometimes *love the treason*, yet they always *hate the traitor*” (114—115). It is curious to see Elizabeth, who knew all the plot so well, *intus et in cute novit*, openly avowing her disbelief in it; and succeeding times believing it all, from ignorance and from faction.

* Goodall, ii. 226.

† Ibid. 227.

“the accusation,” which they had just produced? And *did* she exert “all good means, in favour of “the said Quene of Scottes?” Let the sequel tell, so truly characteristick of her general duplicity.

Three days after her promise, on the 7th of December *, the commissioners of Elizabeth called Murray and his colleagues before them, and addressed them in these words: “My Lords, “the Quene’s Majestie hath commanded us to “say unto you, that her Highness thinketh [it] “very much and very strange, that you should “accuse her [Mary] of so horrible a cryme †.” This was the substantial part of their chiding address. It was what Elizabeth pretended to call, “a round charging and reproof,” and “a reprehending and impugning the accusation by all “good means.” The promise and the performance are just as much alike, we see, as a storm in nature and a storm in the playhouse are.

But the commissioners did not end here. Her Majesty, they add, “therefore hath called us to “say unto you; that although you, in this doing, “have forgot your duties of allegiance toward “your soveraine, yet her Majestie meaneth not “to forget THE LOVE OF A GOOD SISTER, AND “OF A GOOD NEIGHBOUR AND FRIEND ‡.” Elizabeth, then, is determined at last to discharge

* The date in Goodall, ii. 231, Dec. 6, is an error of the pen or press; as is plain from 227 and 235.

† Goodall, ii. 233.

‡ Ibid. *ibid.*

the duties of a good neighbour, a real friend, and a loving sister to Mary. She has strangely “paltered” with her promise indeed, in the reproof before. But she will *now* serve her. Yet how *does* she serve her? The very next words of the commissioners, will shew the kindness intended. And the fact immediately subsequent, will shew the kindness performed.

“What you are to answer to this,” say the commissioners, “we are here ready to hear.” But why was an answer expected? According to Elizabeth’s promise, the rebels were to be sharply rebuked for their presumption, in thinking to accuse Mary of murder. To this no answer was requisite. They *had* accused. This was their *offence*. For this they were to receive a severe reprimand. And the accusation was thus to be “impugned,” by every honest exertion of friendship in Elizabeth. Yet, notwithstanding all this, the rebels are *called upon* to *answer*. They are called upon, IN ORDER to bring forward the concerted reply; and to conclude the whole in a manner, directly the reverse of Elizabeth’s seeming intentions.

Thus are the commissioners, with principles of honour all alive, and active in the breasts of some of them, made to become mere *gentlemen-usbers* to her hypocrisy, and mere *running-footmen* to her revenge. Their souls must have been shocked with the employ. But they were obliged to submit to it. The bold barons, that had so often assaulted the throne even of our warlike monarchs, all crouched at the feet of
 H 2 this

this Henry the Eighth in petticoats. And they were mean enough, to carry on an *evident* scheme of collusion betwixt her and Murray. They *therefore* gave the rebuke in such gentle terms, so contrary to what they themselves had some of them heard her promise*. They *therefore* called also upon the rebels to reply, when all reply was precluded by the *apparent* nature of the business. But the *real* was very different.

Murray, accordingly, came prepared for the latter. He knew the farcical operations, in which these mere shifters of the scenes to him and to her, were now to be engaged. He heard them calmly. He replied. He expressed his sorrow, for having offended Elizabeth by his accusation of Mary. But to “fatisfie” her, he would do—what? He would retract the accusation, to be sure, for which he “found” Elizabeth, as he says himself, “to be *grievously offended*” with him†. And thus Elizabeth will at last have “impugned” the accusation by all good means, in favour of “the said Queen of Scots.” This undoubtedly was the natural process in the business. But there was nothing *natural* in the whole. It was merely an *acted drama*, from the beginning to the end of it. Murray therefore, in order to “satisfy” Elizabeth for the “grievous offence” given, would *repeat* it, and *aggravate* it *highly*. He *would proceed to prove what he had charged*.

This was plainly the point, to which Elizabeth and Murray had been mutually tending, by all

* Goodall, ii. 223.

† Ibid. 234.

these side-movements. Murray *had actually brought his proofs with him*. The commissioners *were actually ready to receive them*. They had indeed *called for them*, in calling for a reply to their rebuke. And thus the “round charge and “reproof,” which Elizabeth threatened to give Mary’s accusers; the “reprehending and impugning the accusation by all good means in “her favour,” which Elizabeth promised to Mary’s commissioners; and “the love of a good sister, and of a good neighbour and friend,” which Elizabeth the moment before declared by her own commissioners, she “meant not to forget” to Mary; all terminated—in making the accusation to be maintained against her, and in encouraging the evidences to be produced for it.

§ V.

ALL this was a very proper prelude, to the second appearance of the letters. They appeared the next day. But what could be expected in fairness or in decency, as to the examination of them; from a woman so apparently hypocritical and base, as Elizabeth is here shewn to be by her own proceedings; and from men so apparently mean and servile, as the commissioners are equally shewn to be from theirs? The conduct of both we must naturally expect, to proceed in the same strain. It cannot well exceed the other. And yet, I think, it did.

“This daye,” say the commissioners on the 8th of December, “the Earle of Murray, according to the appoyntment yesterday, came to the

“ Quene’s Majestie’s commissioners, saying; That
“ as they had yesternight produced and shewed
“ fundry wrytings,” &c. “ so for the further
“ satisfaction, both of the Quene’s Majestie and
“ theyr lordships, they were ready to produce
“ and shew a great number of letters wrytten by
“ the said Quene, wherin, as they said, might
“ appear very evidently her inordinate love to-
“ wards the said Erle Bothwell, with fundry other
“ arguments of her guiltyness, of the murder of
“ her husband. And so therupon they produced
“ severall wrytings wrytten in the like Romain
“ hand, as others her letters which were shewed
“ yesternight, and avowed by them to be wrytten
“ by the said Quene*.” This is the account,
we must remember, given by the commissioners
themselves, concerning their own proceedings.
We cannot desire a better authority, for censuring
them. And they cannot ask a better testimony,
in their own vindication.

Yet what does their account say, for vindica-
tion or for censure? It says this. The commis-
sioners at York, on the previous production of
the letters, had rested their authenticity on the
credit of the offered oaths of the producers. The
commissioners at Westminster, were more attentive
to the rules of common sense and common ho-
nesty. They *compared them with other writings*.
They found them on examination, to be “wryt-
“ ten in the like Romain hand, as others which
“ were shewed yesternight.” And so far they

* Appendix, No. viii.

acted with apparent justness. But this was in appearance only. In reality they acted as unjustly and as absurdly, as the commissioners at York. Yet they conducted themselves with more address. They were more cunning and more knavish. The addition of five to the former three, had given a strong predominancy to the spirit of Elizabeth and of villainy, among them. The majority of the three were honest in intention, and weak in practice. The majority of the eight were actually knaves in design, actually knaves in practice, but studiously courting the semblance of honesty. They therefore pretended to do, what the others had not done; and to examine the grand point on which the whole accusation rested, the hand-writing of the letters. But *how* did they examine it? In a manner that must have pronounced them to be IDIOTS, if we had not known them to be otherwise; and in a manner that must pronounce them to be KNAVES, as we know them to have been men of sense. Like persons totally incompetent to the management of business, but in truth acting ministerially in a work of profligacy; they compared the letters produced, NOT with letters furnished by Mary's commissioners, NOT with letters even furnished by any indifferent persons, BUT with letters *presented by the producers themselves*. They collated them with "OTHERS HER LETTERS, WHICH WERE "SHEWED YESTERNIGHT" (for "THEY had yesternight produced and shewed fundry wrytings"), "and avowed by THEM to be wrytten

H 4

" by

“by the said Quene.” And they thus collated one forgery with another.

This is such an instance of imposition upon Mary and the world, as can scarcely be paralleled in all the annals of knavery. Many, many instances of imposition, indeed, occur in the wretched history of our race. But we can hardly find one, in which the imposition was so gross, so formal, so important, and so clear. It was very gross, because it has not a shred of artifice to cover its ugly nakedness. It was very formal, because it was done by men, some of whom were of the first character in their country; and all were bound by honour, and tied down by oaths, to act uprightly in the business. It was very important, because no less than the reputation of a Queen, and the continuance of an usurpation, depended upon it. And it is very clear, because we have the fact related to us by the commissioners themselves, recorded to their shame in their own journal, and transmitted by their own hands to posterity, with everlasting infamy on their heads *.

* How fully does all this conduct shew, what Mary intimated afterwards in an intercepted letter, to some of her partisans in Scotland! “The Quene of England,” she says, at the removal of the conference to Westminster, “namit *new* “*commissionaris* with thame that wer alreddie depute, in nombre of the quhilk *the said tratour*,” Cecil, “and Utheris “OF HIS FACTIOUN.” Goodall, ii. 326.

CHAPTER III.

§ I.

IT is very surprising, that at this distance of time we can trace the conduct of Elizabeth so particularly, through all the mazes and labyrinths of her cunning. No cotemporary historian has been kind enough, to lend us a clue for them ; though memory must have supplied a variety of incidents at the time, which would have thrown a strong light over the whole. But we are left to collect the general aspect of the transactions, from the very journals of the persons, who are acting with so much artfulness. That spirit of deception, which put them upon acting with the artfulness, would equally put them upon modelling the accounts of their actions. It would naturally induce them to soften the harsher features, and lower the more prominent parts, of their own iniquity. Accordingly we find the journal of the commissioners, to have been actually ALTERED and INTERLINED by the hand of Secretary CECIL himself, after it had been written by the clerks of the commission*. And we must therefore suppose the same hand to have been busy, where it is *not* visible ; and to have fre-

* Goodall, ii. 223, 239, &c.

quently written the original journal, by the pens of the clerks themselves*.

Surrounded as we thus are by artifice and imposture on every side, if in our progress we should meet with any account, that gives a look of fairness and justice to Elizabeth; we cannot but suspect it, of being sophisticated in this manner. We cannot but think, that the secretary has been at work again; has suppressed some circumstance, which would have lent a different appearance to the whole; or has mentioned some with a variation from the truth, which casts a different air over it. With such conduct preceding, as we have just seen in Elizabeth, we have no right to expect any fairness or justice from her. With such conduct succeeding, as we shall soon see in her; we have no reason to believe any thing, but unfairness and injustice, to have come between. Sudden conversions may suit the short and desultory progress, of a novel or a play. But they are little compatible, with the slow and regular operations of the human mind. And relapses, as sudden as the conversions, plainly prove the latter to have been nothing at all.

To such an account as this, are we now come. For Elizabeth, wanting to veil over the shameless management of her own commissioners, even acting under her own influence, ordered a re-

* Accordingly, Mary says, in Goodall, ii. 326, that Cecil "dois all thair draughtis." And Lord Hunsdon, in a letter of Dec. the 20th, says to Cecil concerning this second conference; "the burden wherof, I know, *depends chiefly upon* "yone" (Haynes, 496).

collation of the letters; and a re-collation, not before the commissioners, but before the privy council. This was, by implication, a strong censure upon the commissioners. It intimated in a very striking manner, that they had not done justice in *their* collation; that they had done what required to be re-done; and that their act wanted to be covered and disguised, by a subsequent act of a privy council. The latter was therefore to intrude violently into a business, with which they had no concern. It was all delegated to the commissioners before. It had been executed by them, in the main part of it. Yet this very part was the privy council now to take to itself. It was to supersede the whole delegation for a time. And it was to execute the main part again. But all the wheels in the machine of Elizabeth's government, moved on in perfect harmony. The grand master-wheel in herself, regulated all their motions. And this very council consisted of the eight commissioners themselves, and others*. Some of the commissioners most probably, as we know some of them to have been men of honour; and the Duke of Norfolk pretty certainly, as one of them †; had begun to express their disgust at the infamous collation before, which had been managed by a junto of Elizabeth's more staunch partisans among them, and so forced upon the rest. The apparent knavery of it, must naturally have excited their resentment. They began probably to consider themselves in their true light,

* Goodall, ii. 252 and 254.

† Robertson, ii. 398.

as employed in doing dirty work for the Queen, as mere *scavengers* and *nightmen* to Elizabeth.

And to remove this rising ill-humour, I suppose, it was resolved to act the farce of hypocrisy over again, and to act it in a more artful manner. The re-collation of the letters seems to imply this. The re-appearance of the commissioners in the council, seems to confirm the implication. The Duke of Norfolk, we know, had early seen into the flagitious designs of Elizabeth. He had also received secret intelligence from Lethington at York, that the Queen's hand HAD BEEN FREQUENTLY COUNTERFEITED BY HIMSELF, as her secretary. This was a confession sufficient for him. But Lethington had done more. He had induced the Duke "to think," as the Duke himself assures us, "that the Quene was NOT "guilty of the crimes objected*." From all the Duke had been long apprehensive of the danger of his situation; of the danger to his honour and conscience, if he should agree to condemn the innocent Queen; and of the danger to his happiness in this world, if he should struggle to acquit her, and so provoke what he was sure to incur, the cursed and implacable spirit of Elizabeth for it. And Elizabeth herself, who had

* This is a full refutation of that frivolous argument which is urged by Dr. Robertson in *Diff.* 22, and re-urged in *ii.* 343—344, edit. xi. of Norfolk's believing the letters to be genuine. He believed them to be so, *till* Lethington, who was privy to the whole villainy, "moved" him to consider them as all a forgery; and also "moved" him "to lyke "of a marriadg with the—Quene" accused by them (*Mur-din*, 164).

been marking his conduct with a jealous eye, ever since he frustrated her designs upon him at York; and had seen him since inclining at times, to the side of Mary and of conscience; half-angrily exclaimed upon some fresh inclination of his at this period, “That the Queen of Scots would never want an advocate, as long as Norfolk lived*.”

It was accordingly determined in a previous council, at which all the commissioners were present and five others†, on the 13th of December; that six of the principal nobility should be summoned, to take their seats at the board the next day; that the commissioners should then lay before them, “the whole proceedings in the conference at Westminster;—and that also the original letters and writings, exhibited by the Regent, as the Quene of Scotts letters and writings, should also be shewed; and conference thereof made in their sight, with the letters of the said Quene’s, being extant, and heretofore wryten with her own hand, and sent to the Quene’s Majesty; wherby may be ferched and examyned, what difference is betwixt the same.” This seems fair. But we know Elizabeth too well, to trust the fairness of her appearance. We have already seen her too artful not to be suspected, too false not to be disbelieved, and too dishonest not to be still thought knavish.

We even see her so here. This very council, which was only doing (we may be sure) what

* Crawford, 105—106, and 114; and Camden’s Annals, 116—117, and 118 of the Translation, and 143, 144, and 145 of the Original, i.

† Goodall, ii. 252.

she had determined they should do, resolved for her to tell the commissioners of Mary, this capital falsehood; "That she had caused the Erle of Murray and his company, to be STREIGHTLY and SHARPLY reproved and rebuked, for their audacious and unloyall accusatioun of the Quene, to whom they were natyve subjects; in SUCH LARGE SORT, AS A MORE ERNEST AND SHARPER REPROOF, COULD NOT BE DEvised IN MORE CONVENIENT WORDS*." This the reader knows to be a most glaring untruth. The reproof consisted of these words, that Elizabeth thought it "very much and very strange," they should accuse Mary. This was substantially all. Yet this is asserted by the council to have been, and is recommended to be asserted by the Queen herself, "a streight and sharp rebuke." It is even averred by the council, and even recommended to be averred by the Queen herself, to have been a rebuke "in such large sort, as a more earnest and sharper could not be devised in convenient words." The reproof is a clear evidence of the collusive spirit of Elizabeth. This account of the reproof, is a full demonstration of the high effrontery, with which the collusion was carried on. And, with such effrontery of falsehood in this privy council, what justice and fairness can be expected in the re-collation of the letters?

But the other council met the next day. It consisted of the members of the council held the day before, and six additional members, all earls.

* Goodall, ii. 253.

Elizabeth also was now present. The proceedings of the commissioners at York, as well as at Westminster, were summarily declared for the information of the earls. And another falsehood of a capital nature, was sanctioned by the rest. “There
 “ was briefly shewed unto them,” says the journal, “how the Quene of Scotts commissioners
 “ first accused the Erle of Murray and his col-
 “ leagues;—and how they did therto make an-
 “ swer,—WITHOUT ANY SPECIAL DEPRAVING
 “ OR CALUMNIATING THE HONOUR OF THE
 “ QUENE; and, next therto, the replication of
 “ the other party: and further was declared, how
 “ herupon the same treaty and conference, upon
 “ reasonable causes, was removed to Westmin-
 “ ster; and how the Erle of Murray and his col-
 “ leagues,—*after protestation made*, were *unwilling*
 “ *to procede any further to touch the name and ho-*
 “ *nor of the Quene*, if their adversaries had not
 “ pressed them with lack of loyalty; for remedy
 “ whereof, they produced” their accusation*.

From this account of the conference at York, and from the former of that at Westminster; it seems impossible for Elizabeth’s managers, to speak the truth in a point of any consequence, even for a single moment. The new members were all unacquainted with either, except from report. They were to be informed concerning both, by the relation of one of the commissioners in each. But the relator of each thought it requisite to prevaricate, in his narrative of the facts.

* Goodall, ii. 255—256.

And the same spirit of imposition appears to have predominated in the latter council, as in the former. The whole very material fact, concerning the communication of the letters to the commissioners at York, is totally omitted. It is not only omitted, but denied. Murray and his friends made answer, says the narrator, “without any
“special depraving or calumniating the honour
“of the Quene.” And, as he adds afterwards on the conference being removed to Westminster, “after protestation made” they “were unwilling
“to procede any further, to touch the name and
“honor of the Quene, if their adversaries had
“not pressed them with lack of loyalty; for remedy whereof, they *produced*” their accusation.

They are thus represented by the verbal historian of the conference, as never *producing* any accusation against Mary, much less *producing* any evidences for it, before they *produced* them at Westminster. Thus all exhibition of the letters before is denied, as we have previously seen it repeatedly denied by Elizabeth herself. We must therefore go back once more to the conference at York, as stated by the commissioners themselves. In their very first dispatch to Elizabeth, they say thus of Murray and his friends: “As
“we perceive be their *talk* at large, they *mean*
“to make it evident unto us, that whatsoever they
“have done against the Quene, they have proceeded therein upon good grounds; *such as*
“some of them—do saye, they are most forre
“that it is now come to that pointe, that *they*
“must needes declare and make manifest to the
“world,

“*world*, or else be accounted notorious re-
 “*belles* *.” So plainly did they intimate their
 intentions at the very first meeting in York, of
 charging the Queen with murder! And that the
 commissioners thoroughly understood the scope
 and aim of their intimations, is apparent from a
 dispatch of the same date with the former, writ-
 ten by one of them to Cecil, and speaking in
 these terms. “In my opinion,” says the Duke
 of Norfolk to him, “the matter, I feare, WILL
 “FALLE OWTE VERIE FOWLE, yff all be true
 “*that they beare stedfastlye affirm †.*” But, three
 days afterward, Murray put these very questions
 in writing to the commissioners: “I. We desire
 “to be resolvit, quhether ye haif commissioun—
 “to pronounce in THE CAUSE OF THE MUR-
 “*THER, giltye or not giltye—: III.—In caise*
 “*SHE* be found gilty, we desire to be resolvit be-
 “foirhand, quhether the *QUENE* fall be deliverit
 “in our hands,” &c. “IV. In cais *SHE* be found
 “*giltye*, we desire,” &c ‡. Here Murray opens
 his intentions of charging her with murder, in
 the most publick and formal manner. Yet he
 opened it still more fully, in his speech to the
 commissioners at presenting these questions; when
 he declared, as the commissioners themselves tell
 us, that he and his friends “durste in no wise pro-
 “ceade, to the accusation of the King their Sove-
 “reigne’s mother in THE CAUSE OF THE MUR-
 “DER, before they weare resolved in theis ar-

* Goodall, ii. 114.

† Ibid. 117.

‡ Ibid. 130.

“ ticles *.” And, two days after this, the commissioners farther tell us in their remarkable dispatch of October the 11th, That “ the Erle of
 “ Murray and his colleagues have put in their
 “ anfwere” [“ in the morninge” of that day, says the journal]; “ the copie of which anfwere
 “ we fend herewith to your Majestie : and al-
 “ beit they have in the same touched nothing
 “ plainlie, in THE CAUSE OF THE MURDER;
 “ whereupon they *staye* and *suspend* their proceed-
 “ ings, *untill* they may be resolved in their ar-
 “ ticles proponed unto us, which we sent in our
 “ last letters to your Majestie ; yet the said Erle”
 [“ in the afternoone” of that day, says the jour-
 nal] “ hath bene content privatlie to *shew* us,
 “ SUCH MATTEIR AS THEY HAVE TO CON-
 “ DEMPNE THE QUEENE OF SCOTTES, OF THE
 “ MURDER OF HER HUSBAND †.” From this account it appears, that the rebels had told the commissioners at their very first meeting, of their design to charge Mary with murder ; that they had openly avowed their design, in a formal paper of questions to them afterwards ; that they had opened it still more, in a verbal address to them when they presented the said paper ; and that therefore the commissioners had expected the charge from them, in their reply to Mary’s accusation ; that in the opinion of the commissioners it was intimated, though not *plainly*, in their said reply ; that a clear and direct charge of murder against her was only *staid* and *suspended*, till they

* Goodall, ii. 137.

† Ibid. 139—140.

could receive an answer to some questions from Elizabeth; and that, in the mean time, they actually laid *all their proofs of the murder* before the commissioners. So little did they proceed till the conference at Westminster, “without any special depraving or calumniating the honour of the Quene.” All this very account, also, the commissioners sent to Elizabeth. They even sent her in the last dispatch, a long description of the criminating letters, a large abstract of them, and many extracts from them*. And she even laid all these papers, before her privy council†. Yet, now, some new members of the council, the representatives (as it were) of all the nobility upon this occasion, are told, That no such things had happened‡.

Who the teller of either of these falsehoods was, of that concerning the conference at Westminster, or of this concerning the conference at York; does not appear. Most probably it was Sir Ralph Sadler for the latter, and Sir William Cecil for the former. Both appear to have spoken what they knew to be absolutely false. Nor can any excuse be made for Sir Ralph, from the circumstance of the letters being *privately* communicated to the commissioners. I have already shewn, that the accusers had spoken so openly of their accusation, in conversation with the com-

* Goodall, ii. 150—153.

† Ibid. 170.

‡ Just in the same manner, and exactly in the same spirit, it is as much suppressed by Buchanan in Hist. xix. 373, as it is denied by Elizabeth here; that the letters, &c. were ever shewn at York.

missioners, in a paper of questions presented to them, and in a personal address to them, as to make the commissioners expect it on the 11th of October; that it would *then* have been produced, if a difficulty had not occurred; that it was to be produced, as soon as Elizabeth's answer came to York; and that the proofs and evidences of it, in the mean time, were laid before the commissioners. There was a *little* delay therefore, to the *formal* production of the charge and the letters; but they were both produced in *fact*. The letters particularly, on which the whole rested and balanced, were submitted to the full inspection of the commissioners. They thought it requisite for them *as commissioners*, to make a *publick* dispatch concerning them; and to transmit a description of them, an abstract of them, and even extracts from them, to *Elizabeth*. And Elizabeth thought it equally requisite for her, to lay them all as *publick* papers before her *privy council*.

But it is very observable, that this falsehood concerning the business at York, and the other concerning the business at Westminster, were both told in presence of several persons, *who all knew* the teller *at the time*, to be suppressing a grand fact, to be denying a grand truth, and to be delivering a grand falsehood. So very like were Elizabeth, Elizabeth's counsellors, and Elizabeth's commissioners, in the habit of audacious falsifying! Thus, when the *first* council was informed by Sir William Cecil or any other person, concerning the reproof given by the commissioners to

Murray

Murray and his partisans; all the other commissioners were present. They were well acquainted with the nature of that reproof. They had delivered it themselves, had made it to be recorded on their journals, and knew it to be a very gentle one. Yet they suffered it to be represented to the rest of the council, as a “streight and a sharp” one. They suffered a minute of it, as such, to be entered on the books of the privy council. They even consented to suggest a speech to her Majesty, formally vouching it to be such. And they even agreed to pronounce themselves, and to make Elizabeth pronounce, one of the mildest reprehensions that could well be given; to be “in so
 “large a sort, as a more earnest and sharper re-
 “proof could not be devised in more convenient
 “words.” Just so, when Sir Ralph Sadler or some other informed the *second* council, that Murray had made no “special depraving or calum-
 “niating the honour of the Quene,” before the conference at Westminster; the members present were he, and the other two commissioners at York, the Duke of Norfolk, and the Earl of Suffex. These very persons had known of the intended charge, from the rebels themselves. They had known the charge to be intimated, as intimated it undoubtedly is, though not plainly; in the answer of the rebels. They had known the positive charge to be only delayed, in expectation of a letter from Elizabeth. And they had seen the letters which were to substantiate it; had sent a long account of them to Elizabeth; and had even been influenced by them, to believe the guilt of

Mary in the murder. Yet they now permit a narrative of their proceedings, to be given before them, and to be recorded on the books of the privy council, that omitted and denied all this; that stated no “special depraving or calumniating the honour of the *Quene*,” to have taken place before them at all; and affirmed the first production of the charge, to have been long afterwards at Westminster. To this, all the old members of the council equally agree; though *they* had sat in that very council-chamber, upon the dispatches of the commissioners concerning the letters. To this also Elizabeth agrees, sitting as she was in her chair at the head of the council-table; though she herself had received the letters, had communicated the letters to her council, and had deliberated upon the letters with them. Such a wonderful confederacy appears among them all, in the act of falsifying! With such an amazing congruity, do the head and the members unite together! And such an astonishing ascendancy does the head appear to have had over the members, that what she wills they will; that truth comes recommended to them, only by her adopting it; and observed equivocations, known prevarications, and positive falsities, are all implicitly entertained by them at her beck.

From these facts, drawn as they are out of Elizabeth’s own journals; and from journals too, either altered and interlined, or written originally, by Cecil himself; we may be very certain, that the re-collation of the letters, agreed to in the first council and performed in the second, was
only

only a continuance of the same system of imposition, which we have found so uniformly pursued hitherto, and which we shall see so invariably prosecuted afterwards. The council however met. The letters were produced. And the collation took place. “There were produced,” says Cecil in his own altered and interlined journal of the council, “fundry letters, supposed to
 “be written by the Quene of Scots own hand,
 “to the Erle Bothwell; of which lettres the originals, supposed to be written with the Quene
 “of Scots own hand, were then also presentlie
 “produced and perused; and, being read, were
 “duly conferred and compared, for the manner
 “of writing and fashion of orthography, with
 “fundry other lettres, long since heretofore written and sent, by the said Quene of Scotts to the
 “Quene’s Majesty *;” or, as the council before described them, “with the lettres of the said
 “Quene’s, being extant, and heretofore wrytten
 “with hir own hand, and sent to the Quene’s
 “Majesty †.”

The letters had been authenticated, at their first appearance before the commissioners in York, by the force of affirmations and by the offer of oaths from *the very producers*. At their second appearance before the commissioners in Westminster, they had been authenticated by the written asseverations of *the very producers* ‡, and by the collations of them with letters presented by *the very producers*. And they are now to be au-

* Appendix, No. ix. † Goodall, ii. 252. ‡ Ibid. 92.

thenticated, pretty nearly in the same manner. They are now collated with letters, NOT indubitably originals themselves, and *therefore* proper to be standards of collation to the others. But they are collated with letters, *that require to be previously collated*. They are collated with letters—furnished *by whom?* Not, indeed, as before, by the producers of the letters; *but*—by *their confidante and associate in the business*, even by—ELIZABETH herself. This is obviously a stroke of *legerdemain*, like the other. It is only a more artful stroke. It is apparently a shade of the same darkness of machination. It is only a lighter shade. And it was evidently made to succeed the other, *because* it was more artful and more light.

Murray's letters were compared with some of Elizabeth's. These are said to have been written with Mary's own hand, and sent by Mary to her. But who *witnessed to the hand of Mary?* No ONE! Who *witnessed to the sending of them by Mary?* No ONE! We must take both, upon the authority of Elizabeth and her privy council. But *can* we do so upon any principle of propriety? We certainly cannot. We cannot suffer either the privy council, or their president Elizabeth, to become at once witnesses and judges. This would be confounding capacities, that should for ever be kept distinct; and opening wide the flood-gates of iniquity, upon every accused person. But, even if we could do this, yet can we admit the testimony of either? Or to speak more precisely,

precisely, as the whole centers in Elizabeth herself at last, she being the grand center of gravity to all this political system; can we admit *her* evidence upon the point? We assuredly cannot. We have already seen her so deceitful and so audacious, in all the proceedings hitherto; that we cannot, in common justice to Mary, lay any stress upon her evidence. We shall also see her hereafter so elusive and so shameless, that, in common candour to ourselves, we cannot but reject her testimony with disdain. We have already convicted her, of so many forfeitures of honour, and so many violations of truth; as must operate with regard to her, just as the whipping-post and the pillory do with vulgar offenders, and incapacitate her for being an evidence for ever.

Even if we could allow Elizabeth, to be at once a witness and a judge; and give her such a credit for probity, as would make her a competent witness; yet we certainly cannot admit her to testify to facts, which it was absolutely impossible for her to know. She could not possibly know, that Mary wrote the produced letters to her. She did not see her write them. She never saw her write at all. Nor could she possibly know, that Mary sent them. She was not present, when they were sent. She did not pretend to be so. And she did not pretend to produce any one, who saw them sent, who saw them written, or had ever seen any thing written by Mary.

All her evidence then, and all the evidence of
her

her privy council, which is only hers at second hand, cannot weigh as a single atom of dust in the balance of reason. Common sense, indeed, recoils at the production of such evidence. It considers the cause as a scandalous one, which is by such evidence to be supported. And it looks upon Elizabeth, and her creatures in the privy council, as evidently betraying themselves by their conduct, to be the knavish patrons of a knavish cause.

Elizabeth was too plainly a confederate with Murray, not to be capable of any collusion for him. This has been already shewn. But it may be shewn additionally, from a slight intimation in the journal of this very council. Murray and his friends, it is there said, “after protestation
“made, were unwilling to procede any further
“to touch the name and honour of the Quene,
“if their adversaries had not pressed them with
“lack of loyalty; for remedy whereof, they produced” their accusation*. This was the very excuse and apology, made by Murray himself; he declaring in the protestation, that he and his “cum not willingly to hir accusation of so
“odious a cryme, but are thairto enforcit be
“hir awin pressing, and thair adversaries †.” And all this is absolutely false, as I have repeatedly shewn. Yet Elizabeth was as ready to adopt *his* falsehoods, as she was to manage her own. She could take up, what she knew to be an hypocritical lie in him. She could repeat it with

* Goodall, ii. 255—256.

† Ibid. 205.

the same assurance of hypocrisy, because it was his. And she could thus be content, to reduce herself to the lowest situation in the profligacy of falsehoods; to become the echoer of hypocrisy, the abetter of a lie, and a mere train-bearer to this falsifying Scotchman.

In this debasing spirit of Elizabeth, she seems to have taken some known forgeries of Mary's hand, to have presented them for genuine letters of Mary's composition, and to have collated Murray's with them. That she was capable of this, no one can doubt, who has seen the preceding account, or who shall see the account following. Her commissioners, though some of them men of honour, yet wrought upon by her pervading influence, only a few days before had actually done, what was as bad in reality, and even worse in appearance. They had collated Murray's asserted originals, with Murray's affirmed originals. And as the very channel, by which the latter were conveyed to the commissioners, carried a strong taint with it; the natural recourse was to forgeries, *not* conveyed by Murray, *but* communicated by Elizabeth.

Yet how shall Elizabeth procure them? The same hand, which had fabricated the first set of Murray's originals, fabricated also the second. Yet *these* could not be the letters, produced by Elizabeth upon the present occasion. I do not suppose indeed, that she would have been either afraid or ashamed, of re-producing the letters as her own to the council, which had been previously produced by Murray to the commissioners.

She

She would rather have gloried in the fine dexterity of her management, which had ordered a new collation to be made, and yet collated them with the same papers. But Elizabeth's originals were *addressed to Elizabeth*, which Murray's could not be. And Elizabeth must have derived them from another quarter. A memorial, that was presented to Elizabeth by one of Mary's commissioners, points out to us a quarter, from which they might easily be derived. "My mistress does affirm constantly," says the commissioner, "she never did write ony sic letters as are alledgit; but the famin are forgit and maid expresse lie be hir adversaries, to color thair ungrate and ungodly behaviour toward hir, their native prince and soverane: as their are *sindrie, quha can counterfiet hir hand writ*, quha have been brocht up in hir companie, OF QUHOM THAIR ARE SUM ASSISTAND THEMSELVES, as weill of other natiounis as of Scottis; as I doubt not bot zour MAJESTIE, and divers uthers of zour Hienes's court, HAS SENE SINDRIE LETTERIS SENT HERE FROM SCOTLAND, quhilk wald not be kend [from them] by her own hand writ*." This memorial is dated the 17th † of December, nine days after the production of the letters, and *three* after the pretended collation of them in council. It asserts many counterfeit letters of Mary's, to have been well known to have existed formerly. It appeals

* Goodall, ii. 388—389.

† Ibid. 392, and *Errata* prefixed to vol. i.

for this fact, to the recollection of Elizabeth herself, and of many in her court. And it avers some of Murray's own accomplices, to have counterfeited some of these letters; as Lethington had ingenuously confessed to the Duke of Norfolk at York, that he himself had actually counterfeited some of these or of others*; and as this his confession had been divulged by the Duke, and was now become known unto many†. Yet, notwithstanding such a well-known fact, such a decisive confession, and such an open publication of it; the commissioners of Elizabeth had collated Murray's criminating letters, with some other letters of Murray's. They had thus enabled those very accomplices of his, who are here charged by Mary's commissioner with having forged letters in her name, and one of whom had actually acknowledged the charge before; to obtrude their own notorious forgeries upon them, for genuine writings. And when Elizabeth afterwards ordered another collation to be made, by her council and in her presence; she had probably done, *what this very memorial perhaps intended to intimate she had done*. She had formerly received letters from Scotland, in the name of Mary; which were afterwards found not to be written by her, and yet were in imitation of her writing. Elizabeth, therefore, had nothing

* Camden's Annals, 116 Translation, 143—144 Orig. i. and Crawford, 105—106.

† Crawford, 114, "her—hand, 'twas notoriously known, "Lethingtone, by his own confession, had often counterfeited."

to do at present, but to search out these in her repository of papers, to bring them forward as true originals, and then to apply them as tests of the authenticity of the others. They had been known indeed to be spurious before; but this was all forgotten probably. They had been “long since heretofore wrytten and sent.” And whether it was or was not forgotten, who would be there to *identify* them? Who indeed would *examine* them at all? Who would presume to *shew any doubt* at all, concerning papers produced by Elizabeth as originals, vouched to be so by her own presence at their production, and produced merely for the collation of others with them? No one *would*. No one *did*. That Elizabeth’s letters were genuine, was taken for granted. Not the slightest hint is given in the journal, of any attempt made, or even of any wish breathed; for measuring the standard and for trying the test itself, before they proceeded to apply it to the points before them.

Yet this *must have been done*, if suppositious letters had *not* been used by Elizabeth. *She* would have called the attention of her council, to an examination of her own papers; before she proceeded to Murray’s. *She* would have considered, of some previous mode of assaying their quality; before she would suffer her council, to consider them as sterling. The production of letters under Mary’s hand, by men who wanted to vindicate their rebellion against her, to sanction their seizure of her person, and to confirm their usurpation of her crown; would naturally have
given

given a strong edge of suspiciousness, to the minds of all, and have made the Queen and her ministers peculiarly cautious, in their choice of papers for collating them. Nothing would have been accepted as true and authentick itself, but what had undergone a strict inquisition first. And *then* Murray's papers would have been compared, with *authenticated* originals. But this would not comport, with the flagitious purposes of Elizabeth. To collate the letters with any others, than counterfeits like themselves; it is plain from the past, and will be equally plain from the future, would never be permitted by Elizabeth, and could never be endured by Murray. They had already been collated with counterfeits, which Murray himself supplied. And to collate them with counterfeits, which had *not* been supplied by Murray, and would *not* be examined themselves; was naturally the next step in artful profligacy.

But had Elizabeth never acted flagitiously before, and did she never act flagitiously afterwards; had she always acted with honour before, and was she always to act with honour afterwards; or even had she relented in her mean pursuits, given up all her artifice, and been content to come down to the noble simplicities of probity; or even had she relented only for a season, have then relapsed into all her former sins of dissimulation, and so have been honest only for the momentary interval, between the preceding and the subsequent villainies: yet she must have behaved very differently, from what she did. She
must

must necessarily have sent for THE COMMISSIONERS OF MARY, have told them of Murray's letters, AND HAVE REQUIRED FROM THEM SOME OF MARY'S FOR THE COLLATION. This would have been the *least*, that she could do. This *at least* she would have done. She would thus have retained the power of collating, in her own hands. Mary's commissioners could not possibly have imposed upon her. She might have called for paper after paper from them, in order to examine one by the other, and to compare Murray's with all. She might have written to Mary herself; and sent one of her own commissioners and one of Mary's, to see her write her answer. She might have called for some of the publick records of the kingdom, that had received the signature of Mary to them, a few years before. And she might even have procured letters of hers, which had been equally written a few years before, to her relations in France, to the French, the Spanish, or the Papal courts. Almost *any* of these modes of acting, must have been sufficient for the business. All of them together, must have thrown the light of the noon-day sun over the whole. And all or any would undoubtedly have been used, if Elizabeth had meant to act honestly, even for a single moment.

But she had no such design. She therefore took a very different route. She called upon no foreign courts for Mary's letters. She called for no domestick records subscribed by her. She solicited no letter from her herself, to be written in the presence of commissioners. And she required

quired no letters of Mary's, from her old commissioners in London. She thought it better to supply the want of all, with letters produced by herself, and vouched by herself; to supersede all inquiry into *them*, by leading directly to a collation of the others; upon an acknowledged similarity, to pronounce them both to be authentick; hastily to withdraw them both, when the hasty work was done; and then to record this inquisitorial mockery of justice, in the journals of the privy council, as a full and perfect examination.

§ II.

WHEN Murray produced his false credentials at York, they were *speedily* returned to him. Yet being *privately* exhibited to Elizabeth's commissioners, and therefore in no danger of being shewn to Mary's; they were left long enough in the hands of the former, to be described, abstracted, and even copied in parts, by them. But, when they were re-produced at Westminster, a different form of procedure was followed by Murray. They were *publickly* produced then. They were therefore returned *immediately*. We have a minute of the whole, in the journal of the commissioners. And it carries all the marks, of the shuffling trepidation of a villain, fearful of being detected in his villainous operations. The letters, says the journal, “being *copied*, were
 “ read; and a due collation made thereof, as
 “ neere as could be, by reading and inspection;
 “ and made to accord with the ORIGINALS,
 “ which the SAID EARL OF MURRAY REQUIRED

“ TO BE RE-DELIVERED, and did thereupon *deliver* the COPIES, being collationed *.” He exhibited the originals. He exhibited also copies of them. He had taken care to bring copies with him, because he meant to leave copies only. He induced the board of commissioners, to comply with his wishes. They proceeded instantly, to collate his copies with his originals. This done, Murray demanded back his originals, received them, and then delivered up his copies. And thus the originals were *just shewn and withdrawn*.

This certainly has all the aspect, of an *hocus-pocus* trick of dishonesty. It was certainly one in itself. It was indeed so much one, that we should be perfectly astonished, at the ready submission of the commissioners to it; if we had not already seen them, cowering with such vicious humility before, under the heavy hand of Elizabeth; and if we did not recollect, that this was the very trick, which Murray, about five months before, expressly required Elizabeth to play by her commissioners. “ Sen our servant Mr. Jhone Wode hes the copies of the famin letteris,”—he says, “ we wald earnestlie desyre;—that—the juges may resolve us this far, IN CAIS THE PRINCIPAL AGRIE WITH THE COPIE, that *then* we PRUIF THE CAUS INDEED †.” This accounts for the whole. It shews the influence, that drew them out of the course, which they should otherwise have pursued; and made them move, in such an irregular and eccentric man-

* Appendix, No. viii.

† Ibid. No. iii.

ner. In common justice to the accused Queen, to their own characters, and to their own feelings; they should have required the evidences, on which the accusation was grounded, to be left in the possession of the court. They should then have examined them, with the nicest care themselves. They should have collated them again and again, with authenticated originals. Such a hasty collation of them as they made, with Murray's pretended originals; *even if these had been real*, could never have been satisfactory. A comparison of papers, in order to ascertain the genuineness or the spuriousness of a handwriting, demands a long and painful attention. It is the slow work of hours and of days. And if it is to be done in company, like the business of a commission; it will necessarily proceed with a still slower pace. The commissioners of Mary should also have had free access to them, have been allowed to collate them day after day with their own originals, and been permitted to transcribe them from end to end.—But the forgeries would not bear the inspection. They would soon have been detected by it. They could only bear to be shewn, to be collated with *Murray's own standards*, and then to be instantly withdrawn.

They were, a few days afterwards, exhibited again to the privy council. Who exhibited them, the journal does not tell us; or who received them back again. Murray was not present in the council. But he was attending, no doubt, in one of the rooms adjoining. There probably he put them into the hand of Cecil, and received

them back from him. They had now been collated with *Elizabeth's own standards*, which were equally authentick with Murray's, as she was equally with him in the conspiracy against Mary; and then withdrawn instantly again. We are certain, that they were equally as before returned to Murray. And we actually find him afterwards in Scotland, retaining them in his own possession to the day of his death *.

Mary was thus cut off, from all possibility of inspecting the originals, and of exposing the spuriousness by detecting the handwriting of them. She was reduced to the situation, of a warrior in an Indian ambuscade. She could be wounded at will by her foes. Yet she could not return the wounds. *She could not see her enemy.* And she might therefore, with the utmost propriety of sentiment, and with more than the original sublimity of courage, have said with Ajax in the Iliad ;

Give me but light, and Ajax asks no more.

But, then, this very situation is an ample vindication in itself. Had she been *guilty*; had she, *in the slightest degree*, been accessory to the crime charged upon her; and had there been even a *fair probability*, of proving her guilty of the charge, in spite of her innocence; her enemies would have acted in a very different manner. No ambuscade would they have laid for her.

* Appendix, No. iv.

They

They would never have skulked behind the bushes, and wounded her with invisible shafts. They would have come forward into view, and engaged in open fight with her. They would have produced the originals, with pretended regret and with real triumph. They would have lodged them with the commissioners at York, and the commissioners at Westminster. They would have compelled both, to collate them carefully with private and with publick, with foreign and with domestick, writings of Mary's. Her commissioners would also have *been called upon* to inspect them, *urged* to compare them, *challenged* to disprove them. Mary herself would have been brought up from her confinement in the country, as she frequently requested to be; suffered to enjoy *the freest access* to them; allowed to make *every* objection to them; and heard with all the patience of candour, for *days* and for *weeks*, in her attempts to invalidate their authority. Such *must* have been the demeanour of Murray the producer, and of Elizabeth the receiver, of the letters; if they had thought her *guilty*, if they had thought her *probably* so, or if they had thought her so *in appearance only*. And a conduct, totally the reverse of all this, proves what they never reflected it would prove, the falsehood of their own pretences, and the profligacy of their own conduct. Knaves little think, when they are exerting their arts of imposition, and exhausting their fund of deceit, for the prosecution and concealment of their scandalous purposes;

purposes; that they are telling the world they are scandalous, by their very concealment.

Unapprehensive of such future obstructions to the sight of the letters, Mary, in her original directions to her commissioners, had ordered them thus: “In cais thay alledge thay have ony writ-
“ingis of mine, quhilk may infer presumptioun
“against me in that cause; ze fall desyre the
“PRINCIPALIS to be producit, and that *I myself*
“may have INSPECTION—thereof, and mak an-
“swer thairto*.” Ignorant equally of these precluding artifices afterwards, the commissioners accordingly demanded the sight of the originals now. These were exhibited to the commissioners at Westminster on the 8th of December, and to the privy council on the 14th. And on the 25th Mary’s commissioners appeared before the latter, with a “special command fra thair Maistres;” delivered her message; “producit the special
“writingis and instructionis, sent be thair Maif-
“tres to thame;” and then “maist humblie de-
“syrit the Quene’s Majestie, to CAUSE THAM
“HAVE sic *writingis*, as wer *producit* aganis thair
“Maistres be thair Maistres’s adversaris†.” Those instructions of Mary’s are still in being. They are dated the 19th of December, and run thus: “Ze fall desire the INSPECTION of all,
“thay haif producit aganis us; and that we may
“sè the alledgit PRINCIPAL writingis, *gif they*
“*haif ony*, producit; and with God’s grace we
“fall make sic answer thairto, that our innocence

* Goodall, ii. 342.

† Ibid. 281—282.

“fall be knawin to our guid sifter, and to all
 “utheris princes*.” So little was Mary made
 acquainted, even with the *fact* of the production
 of the letters on the 8th; and so studiously was
 even this concealed, from the commissioners of
 Mary; that she was not yet certified of it, on the
 19th! She had only heard of it by report. But
 she instantly required an inspection of the letters,
 if any such had been produced; and expressed
 her full conviction of ascertaining her innocence
 completely, to the satisfaction of Elizabeth and
 all the sovereigns on the continent. This was
 the natural challenge of innocence, in Mary.
 But her “guid sifter” wanted not to have her
 “innocence knawin.” She rather chose to con-
 sider her as guilty, and to have “all utheris
 “princes” do so too. Yet she could not object
 to the request, though she never meant to grant
 it. This “desire,” say Mary’s commissioners,
 “hir Majestie [of England] thocht verie resson-
 “abill †.” She could not do less. But did she
 grant it? The reader shall see.

If Elizabeth had had *one* spark of honour yet
 unquenched in her breast, she would *instantly*
 have given the requisite orders. But she did *not*
 give them. She said she would *consider* of the
 petition. “To the effect hir Majestie might be
 “THE BETTER ADVISIT upon thair desyris, and
 “give answer thairto;” she “desyrit ane extract
 “of the said writing,” their instructions, “to be
 “gevin to hir Hienes: quhilk the said commis-

* Goodall, ii. 289.

† Ibid. 282.

“fionaris did on the morn deliver *.” She would *consider*, whether she should give to Mary the only possibility, of exposing the spuriousness of a handwriting, which was to support a charge of *murder* against her; by permitting her, or by permitting her commissioners, to inspect the writing. She pretended she wanted time to *consider*, because even *she* had not the audacity to *deny*. She had the audacity, however, to *withhold*. And it is plain from her conduct, that the whole compounded mass of flagitiousness, must instantly have been resolved into dust; if she had granted the requisition. She therefore pretended still to *consider*.

But Mary was too keen and too interested, to be so put off. On the 7th of January following, the commissioners of Mary again entered the privy council, and declared to Elizabeth; that “thay had presentlie reffavit writingis, fra the Quene’s Majestie of Scotland, thair Soverane,” who “desirit THE WRITINGIS PRODUCIT BE HIR INOBEDIENT SUBJECTIS—to be DELIVERED UNTO THAME †.” But Elizabeth was still obliged to withhold her consent, and still compelled therefore to procrastinate. She accordingly took shelter again, behind her old subterfuge of *consideration*. “The Quene’s Majestie of England TUIK TO BE ADVYSIT THAIRWITH ‡.”

Mary, in her *first* requisition, desired not only to see the originals, but to have copies of them.

* Goodall, ii. 282. They accordingly appear in Haynes, 496.

† Goodall, ii. 297.

‡ Ibid. *ibid*.

She demanded “the inspection AND DOUBILLIS,” of all that her rebels had produced against her*. She wanted a sight of them, to examine the nature of the handwriting. She wanted duplicates, to examine the matters contained in them. But when she received an account of Elizabeth’s affected delay, to such an obvious act of justice; she saw through her whole design. She was fully convinced in her mind, that the *originals* would never be submitted to her view, or the view of her commissioners. Yet she was eager to enter upon her vindication. She resolved to engage her enemies immediately. And she was determined to close with them, even under every disadvantage of ground. Such was the natural gallantry of innocence! Her commissioners, therefore, lowered their tone a little in their *second* requisition. They still demanded a sight of the originals. But they would be content, to be indulged with copies only. They accordingly, in the name of their mistress, “desirit the writingis producit be her inobedient subjectis, OR, AT THE LEIST, THE COPIES THAIROF, to be deliverit unto thame †.” And Mary’s instructions to them for this requisition, were even in a still lower key; being only to “require of our said guid sifter, that COPIES be given zou thairof ‡.” This was certainly not judicious, because it committed her honour to the hazard of a battle, in which she *might* not have been victorious. Yet it was the genuine

* Goodall, ii. 289.

† Ibid. 297.

‡ Ibid. 298.

heroism of an honest heart. And, as is frequently seen in life, the injudiciousness constitutes the heroicalness of it.

But this very gallantry of innocence, and this very heroism of honesty, made Elizabeth to shrink the more from a conflict. She retired as Mary advanced. She entrenched herself behind her delays. She dared not to engage an enemy for her bravery, whom she might have defeated perhaps from her rashness. She dreaded the dignity of provoked worth, now it was rising in its own defence. She was afraid of the lion, that she had basely wounded under the mask of friendship, even caught as it was in her toils; when it now began to raise its voice of terrour, against her.

At the last requisition, however, Elizabeth promised to give an answer “within two or three “days*.” But her prime-minister Cecil, that boasted statesman of our isle, and that ever-ready tool of tyranny to his mistress, had previously gone to work in digesting a proposal, which should divert Mary a while from her requisition. He had planned it for Elizabeth, the very day the requisition was made. And Elizabeth accordingly proposed it to Mary’s commissioners, as soon as they had delivered their requisition. It was, that Mary should resign the crown which had been taken from her; that her infant son, who had been made to usurp it, should retain it still; and that she should continue in England

* Goodall, ii. 298.

with the title and appointments of a Queen*. Had Mary been guilty, she would have been glad to escape from prison and from prosecution so easily. But *then* Elizabeth would never have made the proposal. And the majesty of conscious honour in Mary, scorned to stoop to such a palliative, for a cure of her misfortunes. By an act like this, she would have sanctioned all the calumnies, that had been thrown upon her in Scotland; and have established all the charges, that had been brought against her in England. Her commissioners, therefore, spoke out instantly upon the overture from Elizabeth; that “*sch*o
 “*wald NEVER CONDISCEND* to dimit her crown,
 “and had given him,” the Bishop of Ross,
 “special command to declare the *samin*, in cais
 “it were proponit to him †.” Yet Elizabeth was too much bent upon her purpose, to take this prompt reply. She “*did EARNESTLY*
 “*PRESS* him,” that he and the other commissioners of Mary should write to her on the subject. But this “*THAY ALL WHOLLIE AND ABSO-*
 “*LUTELY REFUSIT ‡.*” Such was the powerful conviction of their Queen’s innocence and honour, that reigned in the bosoms of these worthy representatives of hers! Elizabeth however was too resolute upon the point, to be even so beat off. She wanted chiefly to procrastinate, and greatly wanted to do so. She wished to bury the old requisition for a sight of the originals, under a new proposal. She therefore “*desirit thame to*

* Goodall, ii. 300 and 295. † Ibid. *ibid.* ‡ Ibid. *ibid.*

“*ressoun*

“ reffoun and confer, with fum noblemen of hir
 “ Hienes’s counfel, whom her Majestie wald ap-
 “ point, upon that and U^THER thingis quhilk
 “ fould be proponit; and to give thame thair
 “ determinat answer thairto *.”

This was a propofal, to which they could not with any propriety refuse to accede. Elizabeth therefore obtained her defire, of delaying and diverting. The commiffioners met fome of her privy counfellors, two days afterwards. Then there appeared not to be any “ uther thingis, “ quhilk fould be proponit,” and to which they were to give “ thair determinat answer.” There was nothing new propofed, on the part of Elizabeth. There was therefore nothing but the old answer to be given, on the part of Mary. Her commiffioners had only to repeat, as they did repeat in all the firm tone of an innocence, which could neither be frightened nor cajoled; “ That “ the Quene, thair maiftres, wald NEVER consent “ to dimit hir crown, IN ONY WAY, NOR UPON “ ONY CONDITIOUNIS, quhilk WER OR COULD “ BE PROPONIT †.” And Mary herfelf, having been informed of fome overtures of the like nature before, had replied with a grandeur of foul, that muft for ever fet her high in the opinion of the difcerning. “ AS TO RESIGNING MY CROWN,” ſhe ſays, “ I BEG’ YOU TO TROUBLE ME NO “ MORE ABOUT IT; for I AM RESOLVED AND “ DETERMINED, RATHER TO DIE THAN TO DO “ IT; and THE LAST WORD, WHICH I SHALL

* Goodall, ii. 300—301.

† Ibid. 304.

“UTTER IN MY LIFE, SHALL BE THAT OF A
 “QUEEN OF SCOTLAND*.” The force of Mary’s
 intellect, and the vigour of Mary’s honour, break
 out here like a flash of lightning, to awe and con-
 found her adversaries. This answer was never
 seen by Elizabeth. But it was *felt*, in the answer
 of her commissioners at first, and in their reply at
 present; both of them animated with a beam of
 Mary’s fire. The counsellors of Elizabeth pro-
 mised to repeat their reply †. And all thoughts
 of an inspection of the originals, were laid aside
 for the time.

But they would be immediately revived.
 Murray was still in London. The originals were
 there with him. Mary’s commissioners had twice
 called for a sight of them. They had been hi-
 therto put off, under the poor pretence of *consi-*
dering, what nothing but knavery could have
 wished to consider at all. They could not be put
 off any longer. The insidious overture, that was
 to divert *them* from the point, and make *her* a vo-
 lunteer in fixing her own infamy, had been in-
 stantly thrown back in the face of the proposers,
 with all the contempt it merited. And Elizabeth
 had promised an answer to Mary’s second requi-
 sition, in two or three days. To shew the ori-
 ginals, it is plain, would have been death to all
 her hopes. They had been fabricated, no doubt,

* Goodall, ii. 301. “Quant a la demission de ma couronne,
 “Je vous prie de ne me plus empescher; car Je suis resolvé et
 “deliberée, plustost mourir que de faire; et le dernière parole,
 “que Je ferons en ma vie, sera d’ une Royne d’ Escoffe.”

† Ibid. 304.

with great art. The fabricators had been long in the habit, of copying the handwriting of Mary. They could even imitate it so exactly, that, as one of Mary's commissioners tells us, in her name they had sent many letters to Elizabeth formerly, which it was difficult to distinguish from her own. They "WALD not be kend," he says, from them. They *would* not by any common eye be distinguished. But they *could* be by those, who were intimately acquainted with her writing. It is impossible perhaps to counterfeit any hand so precisely, as that it shall not be discerned by an attentive and painful collation. These letters had certainly not been framed so artfully. Mary could easily have pointed out a variety of strokes, in the turn and mould of the characters; which discriminated this writing from her own. Even her commissioners could have done it, likewise. And therefore *neither* of them *were permitted to see the originals*. Yet Elizabeth was in great distress about them, at this instant. She could not refuse an inspection any longer. She could not, however, permit it. In this dilemma, how shall she act? Her cunning failed her at this pressing moment. She could find no further subterfuge of delay. She was therefore obliged, to have recourse to her effrontery and her power. SHE SENT THE ORIGINALS AWAY. The *very next day* after the conference above, she made Murray to appear before the privy council, petitioning for leave to go back into Scotland. She granted it. He set off. *The originals went with him.* And
now

now an inspection could neither be asked by Mary, nor needed to be refused by Elizabeth*.

This was such a bare-faced act of evasion, such an open stretch of dishonesty, and such an impudent defiance of justice; as must have struck every honest man in the kingdom who knew it, with amazement and with horror. On the 10th of January, Murray received permission to depart. But he had been hastily called upon by Elizabeth, to petition for the permission. He was not prepared for his journey. He therefore appeared at court again on the 12th, in order to take a formal leave of the Queen †. Yet he still remained in London. He remained there, for no less than TWELVE days afterward ‡. He had se-

* Goodall, ii. 305. Yet Mr. Hume, with an unfeeling temerity of spirit, has the boldness to assert in Hist. v. 146, That “they *might* have been examined by Mary’s—commissioners.” With the same spirit Dr. Robertson adds, “That Elizabeth urged her [Mary] to vindicate her own honour, “but *Mary avoided* to make any further progress in the “inquiry” (i. 492). Had this been said, *before* Mr. Goodall published that continuation of the conference, which Anderson had knavishly suppressed; as Cecil had with equal knavery suppressed it before (Murdin, 766); this falsification of history, in both these gentlemen, might be ascribed to *unavoidable ignorance*. But *now* it must be ascribed to—what? Let the reader speak for me.

† Goodall, ii. 309 and 306.

‡ Goodall, ii. 313—314 and 322. He was at Berwick, January 31st afterward. See ii. 333. He left London, says Cecil, on January the 18th (Murdin, 766). But this is erroneous. He signed a celebrated paper the very day afterwards, January the 19th, as both Cecil and Murray testify themselves (Goodall, ii. 322). And he actually left London the 24th (Carte iii. 477, from Fenelon’s Dispatches).

veral

veral things to transact. He had particularly money to borrow from Elizabeth, in order to discharge his debts in London, and to defray his expences homeward *. So suddenly had he been called upon by her, to take his journey for Scotland; and so unprepared was he for it, at her call! Elizabeth saw it requisite for him and for her, that he and his criminating letters should disappear at once. He therefore did disappear. He was now supposed to be gone for Scotland, with the originals packed up in his cloak-bag. All access to them was barred up effectually, by the supposition. All would be barred up in fact, by his departure in a few days. An inspection of the ORIGINALS, therefore, was totally out of the question at present.

But Mary's commissioners, in their *second* requisition, had desired the originals, or *at least* the copies of them, to be delivered. Mary also, in her instructions, had condescended to ask for only COPIES of them. These instructions had been even shewn to Elizabeth †. And, in these circumstances, what will Elizabeth do? She has boldly denied all access to the *originals*. But she will certainly grant *copies*. No forgery of handwriting can be detected from *them*. The grand danger of exposure, therefore, is removed. And she will readily catch at the opportunity, of colouring over the high enormity of her conduct with respect to the originals, by a cheerful allowance

* Goodall, ii. 313, and Crawford, 115.

† Goodall, ii. 282.

of copies.—But the policy of Elizabeth was too cautious, even for this indulgence. Her policy was as deep as her villainy. She would not furnish Mary, and she would not furnish her commissioners, even with *copies*. She begged to *consider* of *this* requisition also.

This may seem to my reader an unaccountable hardship at first view, an injury without a provocation, a refusal without a reason, and a mere act of *wanton* cruelty. Cruelty it certainly was. But it was not wantonness. Let us vindicate Elizabeth, where we can. Even to grant copies, was dangerous. To withhold them, was necessary. And the whole system of Elizabethan politicks, might have been thrown wildly out of its orbit by the concession.

Mary's first wish, as I have formerly observed, was very properly to inspect the originals; that she might expose the spuriousness of the handwriting. Her next was to have copies, that she might mark the dates, observe the circumstances, and prove the forgery of the letters from both. By this mode of examination, Elizabeth was afraid that Mary would have proved her point. She probably would. Her natural readiness of apprehension, would have been improved by her interest in the cause. Her natural clearness of conception, would have been heightened by her conviction of the villainy. Her memory, and her papers, would have supplied her abundantly with circumstances and dates. And the whole of that visionary fabrick, must in all probability have sunk away before her, as she advanced. So

ill-contrived were these boasted evidences of guilt, that they could not bear to be examined, even through the medium of a copy! At least *Elizabeth*, who knew them well, thought them so. She therefore resolved to refuse Mary, even a copy of them. Yet she could not refuse it in terms. She had already herself pronounced the demand for “inspection and doubles,” to be “very reasonable.” But she had evaded the one before. And she equally evaded the other now.

On the 13th of January, when Murray and the originals were still in London, but *the very day after he and they had formally taken their leave*; she prepared to give the answer, which she had so long withheld. She had now been *twenty* days, since the first requisition. She had now been *six* since the second, though she then promised an answer in two or three. She had taken ample time, for *advising herself*, upon the important business. The first requisition was for a sight of the originals. The second was for that, or, at the least, the copies of them. But the originals had hastily withdrawn themselves from court, the day before. They were now to be supposed on their way to Scotland. Elizabeth therefore resolved to give no answer, concerning *them*. Yet she noticed the requisition for them. But she answered only to the requisition for *copies*. And *these* were *still* to be *withheld*.

Yet even “the lion-port and awe-commanding face,” which Mr. Gray has given to Elizabeth; or, to speak in a truer and soberer style, the sternness of majestick confidence in her; could

could not stand the brunt of refusing *such* a request, under *any* pretence. She delegated the daring work to her unblushing Cecil. And he spoke to Mary's commissioners, in the name of his mistress then absent, and as the voice of her privy council then present, in this remarkable manner. He first recapitulated their request. This was, he said, "to have the copies of all articles, presumptionis, with the PRINCIPAL writingis product *". He then replied, as immediately from Elizabeth, "that scho will not refuis unto the Quene, hir guid sifter, to give the DOWBILLIS of all that was product †." She slides off very artfully, we see, from the primary part of the requisition, as stated by Cecil himself; and rests only on the secondary. For *this* also she had fresh delays. She *would* grant it; *but* she must previously have a promise. She will have a promise under Mary's hand; and with Mary's signature to it too, in order to authenticate it more thoroughly. Yet what is this promise to be? It is to be no less, than that Mary should do—what?—that she should do what she was most earnest and importunate to do; what she was at this very moment pressing Elizabeth to enable her to do, by a sight of the papers;—that *she would answer to the charges in them*. "Scho will have a special writing sent be the Quene of Scottis, her guid sifter, signet with her awin hand; promising that scho will answer to the samin writings and things laid to her charge, but [without] ony exception ‡."

* Goodall, ii. 310. † Ibid. ibid. ‡ Ibid. 310—311.

The commissioners of Mary, astonished at such a delay at the close of all the others, remonstrated with her representative upon the poorness and pettiness of it; as she had already received *such a promise in such a form*, no less than *twice*. “The
 “famin appears not to be necessarie,” they replied, “in respect of TWA several writingis
 “SCHAWIN and read in prefence of hir Majestie
 “and hir counsal, subscrivit with hir [Mary’s]
 “awin hand AND UNDER HIR SIGNET; quhair-
 “of the extract was deliverit to the Quene’s Ma-
 “jestie of England, in the quhilk scho OFFERIT
 “TO MAK ANSWER upon certane conditiounis
 “thairin expremitt, *sua being scho may have the*
 “*writingis, or at leist the copies of thame*.*” Elizabeth, or her Cecil, did not pretend to assert the insufficiency of these promises in themselves. Why then should they be repeated? Elizabeth had already seen them, not only subscribed by Mary’s own hand, but also certified by Mary’s own seal. Why then should she ask for another, that was to be only subscribed? For this reason.

She pretended to believe at present, that the original commission from Mary to these her commissioners, was terminated by an act of theirs some time before. “The Quene’s Majestie,” says Cecil, “desyris to have sic a writing of the
 “Quene’s Majesty zour maistres, *because scho*
 “*understandis that zour commissioun quhilk ze*
 “*had is expyrit, sen ze did discharge the con-*
 “*ference at Westminster †.*” This was done by them on the 6th of December before ‡. But this

* Goodall, ii. 311.

† Ibid. ibid.

‡ Ibid. 227.

was two days *previous* to the production of the letters. And Elizabeth had been acting with them UNDER THAT VERY COMMISSION, repeatedly since. This we have sufficiently seen before, in their two demands for a sight of the originals, or for copies of them; in their shewing their special instructions to her; in their delivering her an extract from them; and in her promise of an answer to both. So paltry, even from Elizabeth's own principles and practices, does this evasion of Elizabeth's appear.

But she had also another. Let us attend to it. Perhaps it may be a more dignified reason. It may at least carry more the semblance of a reason.

She equally pretended to think, that, by their last instructions from Mary, they were only authorized to *call* for the papers, but not to *answer* them. She desired to have such a writing, says Cecil, "because scho understandis that be zour
 "last writingis ze reffavit, [ze] have powar to
 "require the copies of the writingis, bot not to
 "mak answer*." But what were the last instructions sent them by Mary? They were these:
 "Ze fall require our said guid sifter, that copies
 "be gevin zou thairof, *to the effect*, that THAY
 "MAY BE ANSWERIT particularlie†." These *very instructions*, and in these *very terms* too, *were delivered* by the commissioners to Elizabeth on the 8th of January, only *five* days before. And on the 7th of January they declared to her, "That

* Goodall, ii. 311.

† Ibid. 298—299.

“ they had presentlie reffavit writingis fra the
 “ Quene’s Majestie of Scotland, thair Soverane;
 “ be the quhilkis they were of new commandit
 “ to signifie unto hir Majestie, that scho would
 “ ANSWER to the calumnious accusation of hir
 “ subjectis,—and THAIRFOIR desirrit the writingis
 “ producit,—or, at the leist, the copies thair of,
 “ to be deliverit unto thame, that THAIR MAIS-
 “ TRES MIGHT FULLY ANSWER THAIRTO*.”

Yet Elizabeth now pretends to believe, and pre-
 fumes by the mouth of Cecil to say; that, “ by
 “ their last writings received,” they “ had power
 “ to require the copies of the writings, but not
 “ to make answer.” She therefore wanted to
 have a promise of answering, from Mary. But
 they were instructed by Mary to call for the pa-
 pers, under *an express promise* of replying to
 them. They were instructed by her to call for
 them, *that* she might reply to them. And she
 and they in the solemnest manner promised, that
 she would make, and they would present, *a full
 and particular reply*. So much more paltry, if
 possible, is *this* reason than the other!

Elizabeth, indeed, must have been *now* re-
 duced to the greatest difficulties. She would
 otherwise *not* have rested delays, so necessary to
 her purposes, upon props so rotten as these.
 They serve therefore to point out to us in the
 strongest manner, that extremity of distress, in
 which she was labouring and struggling at this
 moment. They serve to give an uniformity of

* Goodall, ii. 297.

meanness, and a consistency of falsehood, to all her actions. And at the close of them let me hope, for the credit of that best part of Elizabeth, her head; that these were the paltriest elusions, which this elusive princess ever made use of, in all the doublings of her crooked policy*.

§ III.

WHEN first the pretended proofs of the guilt of Mary, were laid before the commissioners at Westminster; Elizabeth and her counsellors were very ready, to promise Mary a sight of the letters. They knew a sight of them to be necessary, for her replying to them. They would not pretend to think her guilty, because she did not reply; and yet at the same time preclude her, from all possibility of replying. They would not be so much worse than inquisitors, in this. They would not shew themselves so lost to all

* Mr. Hume himself asserts this conduct of Elizabeth, to be "a final refusal" of all copies to Mary (v. 152). Yet inconsistent with himself, as well as contradictory to facts, in the same spirit which I have been obliged to reprehend before, and to the equal amazement (I doubt not) of all my readers, he has the boldness to affirm; that Murray "gave Mary herself an opportunity of refuting and exposing him," in the production of the letters, "if she had chosen to lay hold of "it" (v. 147); when she was debarred from all inspection of the originals herself, when she was debarred from all inspection by her commissioners, and when (according to Mr. Hume himself) she and they were equally debarred from all copies. It is to the disgrace of our national probity, more than of our national judgment, that such facts have met with such advocates.

sense of decency, all feeling of shame, and all fear of God *. But alas! what could they do? Mary's commissioners had unluckily taken a step, which the Queen and the Queen's ministers could not but suppose, to have dissolved their commission. They were merely "servitors" now "to the Scottish Queen," and not "commissioners" from her †. Elizabeth therefore could not *shew the papers* to them, or call for an *answer* from them. If it had not been for this grand obstacle to the business, she would *instantly* have *laid all the evidences before them*. But, as it was, she must call upon Mary herself to answer. And, if she will *promise* to answer, she shall have *every information that is requisite*.

This is the very language of fairness. These are the very sentiments of honour. Nor can their existence be doubted. They are recorded in the journals of the privy council, as suggested to Elizabeth, and as spoken by her. "If the
" sayd Bishop and his colleagues," says a speech framed by the privy council for Elizabeth, concerning Mary's commissioners, "had not, *as it*
" *is supposed*, dissolved their commission by Scot-
" tish protestations, whereby they have not, *as it*
" *is thought*, now any authoritie to make answer
" therto; THEY SHULD BE MADE PRIVIE TO
" THE SAYD EVIDENCES AND PROOFS, WHEREBY

* Yet Cecil is all this, in Goodall, ii. 296; when, in a paper drawn up by himself, and dated Jan. 7th, he says, "the Queen of Scots doth *not answer* to the crime of murdering her husband."

† Goodall, ii. 252.

“hir Majestie might have of them some good
 “answer.” This address was to be made directly
 to the commissioners themselves. In it Elizabeth
 “therefore wisheth, that they wold advertise the
 “Quene their mistres of thus much.” And,
 “if it shall please hir to gyve *authoritie* to any
 “hir *commissionars* to *answer the same*, or other-
 “wise to *answer the same herself*;—hir Majesty
 “will be right glad thereof, and will *for that*
 “*purpose* CAUSE EXPEDITION TO BE MADE, OF
 “ANY THYNG THERTO REQUISIT *.” And Eli-
 zabeth herself actually told the commissioners to
 the same purport, on the 16th of December fol-
 lowing; That “hir Majesty would CAUSE THE
 “SAME MATTERS TO BE OPPENED AND DISCO-
 “VERED TO HIR,” Mary, “*if so* that she wold
 “be content to agree to make direct answer ther-
 “to;—hir Majesty thinking it always *very ne-*
 “*cessarie for hir, to make answer*: for otherwise,
 “whosoever should advise hir to forbear mak-
 “yng answer, *having so many ways to do the same*,
 “only because she might not come to hir Ma-
 “jesty’s presence; howsoever they shuld seme
 “and appeare to be good servants for hir, surely
 “they should rather be thought and judged, for
 “some other respects to *betray* hir;—neither
 “could she fynd, *how the Quene shuld more*
 “*redely procure hir condemnation, than to refuse to*
 “*answer* †.”

Such is the upper side of the card! But let us now look at the under.

* Goodall, ii. 253—254.

† Ibid. 263—264.

Before Mary could receive an account of this address to her commissioners, only three days after it, and on the 19th of December*; she had sent fresh instructions to them. She ordered them to wait upon Elizabeth, to promise her an answer, and to require a sight of the letters. They did so accordingly. They shewed also their instructions. They equally delivered an abstract of them. Elizabeth saw the one, and received the other. She declared the request for the papers, to be “very reasonable.” She declared herself “verie glad, that her guid sifter “wald mak answer IN THAT MANNER, for defence of her honour †.” And she and her commissioners received from them, *expressly as*

* That Mary could not have received an account of this address then, might be left very safely to rest upon its own evidence. But I shall mention two facts, that prove it. On the 22nd of December, 1568, Lord Boyd left London, on a particular message from Elizabeth to Mary (Goodall, ii. 278). How long then was he in going? He was no less than *six* days. He reached Mary on the 27th (ii. 314). And we may additionally observe, that this very dispatch of Mary’s, which was dated the 19th, was not received till the 24th (ii. 280—281); being just as many days in going from Bolton Castle to London, as Lord Boyd was in going from London to Bolton Castle. The latter was not the town of that name in Lancashire, which was never honoured with the residence of Mary; but is said in Cabala, 1st. pt. 138, to be “a castle of the Lord Scroop’s in the edge of Yorkshire next “Cumberland,” which is mentioned by Leland (i. 90. v. 117—118, and viii. 13 and 18—19), and by Camden (919—920, Gibson, edit. 3d). It lies indeed between Ascrig and Middleham, near the Ure, far from Cumberland, but not far from Westmorland.

† Goodall, ii. 281—282.

commissioners,

commissioners, an answer to Murray's previous protestation; the answer beginning thus: "We, "THE COMMISSIONARIS for our Soverane Lady "the Quene's Majestie of Scotland, do lay and "propound befoir zour honorabill Lordships," &c *. Elizabeth therefore is now satisfied. The "commission" is *not* "dissolved." All "thoughts" and "suppositions" that it was, are now removed. Mary has "given authority to "her commissioners to answer." They have already begun to answer. They have already answered all the papers, that have been communicated to them. And they now call for *the letters*, that they may answer *them*. Mary is as much convinced as Elizabeth was, that it is "very "necessary for her to make answer," and that she could not "more readily procure her condemnation, than by refusing to answer." Her commissioners, therefore, will now "be made "privie to the evidences and proofs, whereby" they may be enabled to answer. Elizabeth will now, "for that purpose, cause *expedition* to be "made of *any thing* thereto requisite." And she will instantly "cause the same matters, to be "opened and discovered" to them.

Such is the figure that we fancy we shall find below, when we turn up the card! But alas! *dessous des cartes*, we find a very different appearance. We expected a QUEEN, and we meet with a KNAVE.

The "expedition" that was here before, is

* Goodall, ii. 289—282.

now all vanished. The “any thing,” that was to be produced, is now transformed into “no-thing.” Elizabeth *begs to be advised*, concerning *the performance of her own promise*. She wants time to consider, whether she shall grant what *she has already offered*, what *she has offered with earnestness*, and what she has *almost obtruded* upon the commissioners in her zeal for Mary. She is debating and debating with herself, for fourteen days; whether she shall allow, what she has already *pronounced* to be *absolutely necessary* to the *making* of Mary’s *answer*, and *absolutely necessary* to the *maintenance* of Mary’s *honour*. At the end of that long period of consultation, she is still not resolved. Her consultation has ended as it began. She is not yet able to give an answer, though she was so prompt with her proffer before. Her mind now requires to be *impelled* into decisiveness on a point, on which the weakest could hardly allow itself to waver, and the wickedest would be almost ashamed to hesitate.

The old requisition, therefore, is reinforced by a new one, on the 7th of January. Yet even this cannot give direction to that balancing tide, which lately ran so rapidly one way. Elizabeth still wants two or three days more. She takes them. She takes *six*. On the fourth day, the commissioners of Mary remind her of their requisition. They tell her before all her council, and before Murray and all his associates in vice, That they had already offered, in their mistress’s name, “to answer to all the calumnies alledgit
“or producit aganis hir; SWA BEING that scho
“might

“ might have the copies of the pretendit writ-
 “ ingis given in, quhilkis thay have DIVERSE
 “ TYMES REQUIRIT of the *Quene's Majestie* and
 “ hir *counsail*, suppois [though] THAY HAVE NOT
 “ AS ZIT OBTENIT THE SAMIN; and HOW SONE
 “ that thay reffavit the copies thair of, *scho wald*
 “ *answer thairto* *.” This was a very sharp re-
 buke, from these tongues of Mary's employing.
 Elizabeth resolves to reply to their repeated re-
 quisition, two days afterward. But even then
 she cannot yet grant—what she has declared it
 very reasonable to ask, what she has pronounced
 it very necessary to grant, and what she has re-
 peatedly insisted upon Mary's asking, and her
 granting to her. She has strange scruples about
 her, *now*. She lately used all the violence of
 expostulation and remonstrance, to make Mary
 promise an answer. Mary has promised one.
 Mary has promised one in the fullest and most
 formal manner. Yet Elizabeth is still afraid,
 that she will not answer. She has promised in-
 deed. She has done all, that Elizabeth asked
 her to do. But Elizabeth wants her *now* to do
 more. Elizabeth wants her to promise again.
 Will one promise, then, be more binding than
 another? And was any promise necessary at all?
 Certainly not. If Mary did *not* answer, because
 she was refused admittance to the presence of
 Elizabeth; however reasonable the demand
 might be for admittance, the world of half-
 judging fools would undoubtedly have condemned

* Goodall, ii. 308.

her as guilty. *This* Elizabeth suggested to her. *This* Mary knew without the suggestion. *This* therefore superseded the necessity of any promise. It was a stronger bond of obligation upon Mary, than all the promises which Elizabeth could have demanded from her. Yet Elizabeth hoped and trusted, that she would *not* answer. She therefore, in the usual tenour of her conduct, urged and pressed her to do—what she was still persuaded she would *not* do. She held out the criminating papers to her in one hand. She brandished the rod of infamy in the other. She called, she adjured, and she threatened, to make her take the former. Unconscious of all this, Mary had resolved to *ask* for them. She did ask. Then the hands were hastily withdrawn. The rod was flung away. The papers were pocketted. And Mary was cast off with a *second* offer, of seeing them when her commissioners had *that* authority to act, which Elizabeth herself previously acknowledged them to have; and when she herself had promised to do, *what* she had already promised twice, and *what* in common sense she needed not to have promised at all.

I have gone over this curious manœuvre of Elizabeth's so particularly, in order to shew her in all her shifting attitudes of meanness, to her wild admirers. I chose to restrain my resentments. I thought it better to ridicule than to brand. I know not, whether *that* may not be a severer punishment than *this*. It was certainly more agreeable to myself. But I must now proceed to two or three other points. And I shall

then resign up Elizabeth, to all her merited infamy for the present.

§ IV.

WHEN Elizabeth, on the 10th of January, gave Murray permission to depart into Scotland, and when, on the 12th, she took a formal leave of him in her privy council; she not only sent off the originals, far from any inspection of Mary's or of her commissioners, but she also *put an absolute end to the whole inquisition.* When Murray appeared in the privy council on the 10th, he came with all his brother-commissioners; with all that he himself, in the pretended name of the infant son of Mary, had commissioned to act with him in the business. "The Erle of Murray," says the register of Mary, "AND HIS COMPLICES, came before the Quene's Majestie's counsal of Ingland." Then Cecil spoke to them thus: "Quhairas the Erle of Murray, AND HIS ADHERENTIS, cum in this realm, at the desire of the Quene's Majestie of Ingland, TO ANSWER TO SIC THINGIS, AS THE QUENE THAIR SOVERANE OBJECTIT AGANIS THAME AND THAIR ALLEDGEANCES; hir Majestie thinketh meit not to restrain any farder the said Erle AND HIS ADHERENTIS libertie, bot suffer him and thame at thair plesour to depart, relinquishing thame in the famin stait, in the quhilk thay wer of befoir the cuning within this realme, *till scho heir farder of the Quene of Scotland's* ANSWER to sic things, as has
" been

“ been *allegit aganis hir* *.” So also on the 12th, says the same register, “ the Erle of Murray, and ALL his adherentis, came to the presence of the Quene’s Majestie of Ingland, and gat licence to depart into Scotland †.” There they were to stay, *till* Elizabeth heard farther of Mary’s answer. But Elizabeth took care, that Mary should never put in any answer at all, by withholding the letters from her. They were therefore remitted into Scotland, *ad Græcas calendas*. And the inquisition was to all intents and purposes eventually broken up, by this violent act.

These commissioners had been constituted, in order “ to convene with the commissioneris and deputis of the Quene of England, at the citie of York, *or any other place or placis* they shall think convenient; and thair to make plane and ample declaratioun to thame, for information of our said guid sifter, of the” &c. “ with all causis” &c. “ that hereafter shal fall out, UNTO THE RETURN OF OUR SAIDIS COMMISSIONARIS ‡.” They had accordingly appeared at York and at Westminster. There, from accused persons, they were allowed to become accusers. They put in their charge of murder against Mary. *Mary’s commissioners received a copy of the charge.* They next produced their pretended authorities for the charge, in producing the letters. Mary’s commissioners required to *see* these alleged handwritings of their Queen. *But they*

* Goodall, ii. 305.

† Ibid. 309.

‡ Ibid. 120.

were not allowed. They again required to see them. *They were still not allowed.* They then required to have *copies* only. They promised, if they might only have *copies*, to answer *fully* and *particularly* to the letters. *Yet they were still not allowed.* And Elizabeth, hard-pressed with their réquisitions, sent off the originals in a hurry to Scotland, and dispatched the managers of the accusation with them. From that moment, there was a final conclusion to the whole business. The return of the rebel commissioners into Scotland, *vacated their commission expressly.*

But, even if it had not, who was now left to manage the accusation? Murray, and all the other commissioners on the accusing side, were gone. In their absence, how could the accusation proceed? They had brought their charge. They had produced their proofs. They had done no more. The great and important work of inspecting, of examining, and of replying to the charge and the proofs, was still behind. Mary is called upon with all the vehemence of zeal, to do this. She steps forward to do it. *Then* the originals are immediately withdrawn. All inspection is now at an end. Yet examination and reply are still open. She steps forward to examine. *Then* the copies are refused. All reply is thus precluded. But, as copies cannot be positively refused for ever; as it is proper to promise at present, and may be perhaps necessary to grant hereafter; a sure and decisive stroke of preclusion shall be played, before the promise, shuffling and unmeaning as it is, may with safety

be given. *The rebel commissioners shall be sent in an instant away.* Then, if Mary should at last overcome every pretence of delay, by every compliance with requisitions; if Elizabeth should be forced at last to concede, what she had so long withheld; and if Mary should pretend to disprove the dates, and the circumstances, of the letters; yet who was there to *rejoin* to her?

Who indeed was there to *receive* her reply before? Not the commissioners of Elizabeth. *They* were equally *annihilated* with the rebel commissioners, by the departure of these into Scotland. And *their* commission was equally terminated by the act. Their *first* commission, that for the conference at York, ran in these terms. “I having,” says Elizabeth, “sent and required them of the
“other part, which profess their obedience to
“hir [Mary’s] son the Prince; that some of the
“principal of them would come into our realme,
“to answer to such things, as should be on the be-
“halfe of our said sister objected against them;—
“do make, constitute, and ordaine Thomas,”
&c. “to commune, treat, and conclude, with
“James Erle of Murray, and all others of the
“realme of Scotland, that shall come into our
“realme *.” Their *second* commission also, that for the conference at Westminster, gives them authority in the same language, “to bear, com-
“mune, treat, order, and conclude,—with the
“commissioners and deputies of the Quene of
“Scotts, and also with the said Erle of Murray,

* Goodall, ii. 95—96.

“and all others authorized with him in commission.”* And the dismissal of Murray and his brethren into Scotland, which in an instant extinguished the conference, in the same instant extinguished the authority of Elizabeth’s commissioners too.

Elizabeth knew, that all this would be the consequence of sending away the commissioners of either side. She had therefore refused to let Mary’s depart before. These had taken a violent disgust at the gross partiality of Elizabeth, in suffering the bastard Murray to appear at court with his recriminating accusations, while she, the original accuser and a Queen, was kept at a distance and in prison; and at that affected prudery of Elizabeth, which was surely the very quintessence of hypocrisy in her, and made her fearful she should dishonour and disgrace forsooth! the virgin purity of her own character, if she admitted Mary to her presence. They therefore wished to terminate the conference, and to return home. But she would not suffer them to stir. She continued the conference, in spite of their protestations. She kept them at London, in spite of their petitions. And she would not consent, she said, that *“any of them should depart into Scotland, BEFOIR THE END OF THIS CONFERENCE †.”* Yet now, now, she found it ne-

* Goodall, ii. 191.

† Ibid. 269. Mary also thought the conference would be at an end, by her commissioners leaving London. See her address accordingly, not about Jan. 18, 1569, as Goodall, ii. 325, dates it: but about December 18, 1568, as p. 280—281, 314, *“laitlie,”* 327, *“sixth of this moneth,”* and 328 shew.—

cessary for the *rebel commissioners* to do, what she would not permit Mary's to do before.

She had foreseen the necessity from the beginning. She had actually provided for it. She knew from the beginning, that the letters would not bear an inspection, even by the dim light of a copy. She had therefore determined they should not be seen at all, by Mary or by Mary's commissioners. She had resolved, if Mary should call for them, to "whistle them off, and let them "down the wind" at once. It was accordingly entered in the journal of her privy council, *even so early as the 30th of October before*; that, "after "the messengers of Scotland SHALL HAVE SHEW- "ED THAIR PROVES,—it is thought good, the "Erle of Murray *should* BE LICENSED TO RE- "PAYRE HOME*." So early did Elizabeth draw out, the great outline of her own conduct in this business! So long was Murray's departure determined, before the day he was particularly ordered to depart! Murray indeed had put in his proofs on the 8th of December, about five weeks before. But a prospect of terminating the whole more happily than had been expected at first, had *then* presented itself to the mind of Elizabeth. The commissioners of Mary had protested, that they would proceed no further in the conference. Elizabeth readily caught at this. She hastened the production of the proofs. She called upon the commissioners, she called upon Mary; she threatened her, she bullied them;

* Goodall, ii. 182.

for an answer. She had now all the game in her own hands. And she meant to play it triumphantly, in a continued refusal from Mary to answer, and in a consequent conviction of her guilt upon the minds of all. Then the plan of October the 30th, would have been entirely deserted. Murray and his brethren would have remained in London, waiting for the answer, and rejoicing in the delay. Elizabeth would have still gone on for weeks probably, exhorting Mary, exhorting her commissioners, insinuating to her that she was betrayed by them, insinuating to them that they were deceived by her, and so blazoning more and more the silence and the shame of Mary. At last probably, it would have been recorded in the journal of the commissioners, on the books of the privy council, or on both; that the charge was sufficiently ratified by the silence. Mary would have been put down as a wilful mute. And the *peine forte et dure* of publick infamy, would have been pronounced against her. But alas! this hopeful view was soon lost. Mary saw the designs of Elizabeth. She counteracted them. She came forward to answer. She called for a sight of the letters, that she might answer. She called for them repeatedly and loudly. She was earnest to have them, and eager to answer them. And Elizabeth was compelled to recur to her original purpose, to send away the letters, to send away the producers; and so to sweep away the commissions and the conferences, the charge, the proofs, and the reply, with one indignant stroke of her hand.

§ V.

WHEN this inquisition was first begun, Elizabeth had expressly and solemnly declared to the rebels themselves, her resolution to restore Mary to the royalty, from which she had been driven by them; unless she was proved guilty of the murder of her husband. She therefore speaks thus, in her commission for the conference at York: “If her Majestie shall find it to be
 “PLAINLY AND MANIFESTLY PROVED, that
 “the said Quene of Scots was the deviser and
 “procurer of that murder, or otherwise was
 “guilty thereof; surely her Majestie would *think*
 “*her unworthy of a kingdom*, and wold not stayne
 “her own conscience *by restoring her to a king-*
 “*dom* *.” Her commissioners, also, speak in the very same terms to Murray at York †. And Cecil, in one of his wily projects upon paper, dated the 22nd. of December afterwards, says thus in allusion to both: “Her Majestie did resolve,
 “and so *caused to be pronounced to the Earl of*
 “*Murray*, at the *beginning of this* conference;
 “that, *if the Queen of Scots should* NOT be found
 “APPARENTLY guilty of the murder, SHE
 “SHOULD BE RESTORED TO HER ESTATE ‡.” Accordingly Mary, independently of Elizabeth’s unconditional promise to herself, and with only the natural sanguineness of conscious innocence, might well imagine she should be immediately restored, by the arms of Elizabeth, to her crown.

* Goodall, ii. 99.

* Ibid. 127.

† Ibid. 275.

She even showed this imagination, in the formality of her commission for the conference. "Forasameikill as it hath pleasit," says she, "the Quene's Majestie of Ingland,—to take
 "upon her the RESTORING OF US TO OUR
 "REALME AND AUTHORITIE," &c*. Such was the expectation of Mary, and such were the good grounds upon which it was built!

But what was the result? *Was* Mary restored to her kingdom? Or was she found *apparently* guilty, and the murder *plainly and manifestly* proved upon her? She was certainly *not* found *apparently* guilty. The murder was certainly *not* proved *plainly and manifestly* upon her. Indeed the process of inquiry had gone no farther, than barely to *put in* the pretended charge, and to *shew* the pretended proofs. The proofs were then withdrawn. All cool and steady examination of them, even by the *judges* themselves, was prevented. They refused indeed to be submitted, to the examination of any one. They were properly, therefore, no proofs at all. They would not be examined in person. They would not be examined by representation. In this mode of conducting the business, and from this issue to the whole inquiry, nothing was and nothing could be proved, except the flimsiness of the accusation. If Mary had been never so guilty, she could never have been shown guilty by such a mode of procedure as this. But, as I have hinted more than once before, such a mode would never

* Goodall, ii. 118—119.

have been adopted, if she had been actually guilty. Murray was glad to escape from his own accusation, with his originals not openly detected to be forgeries. Elizabeth was pleased to terminate the whole conference abruptly, rather than suffer Mary to see, to detect, and to expose, the forged evidences against her. And she was even willing to subscribe to Mary's innocence, *before* Mary had an opportunity to show it by making a reply.

In the very moments, in which she licensed Murray and his associates to depart into Scotland, she pronounced the sentence of Mary's acquittal. She made her grand organ of business, Cecil, to speak it in the presence of *all her privy council*. To "the Erle of Murray and his adherents" he said, by the command of Elizabeth, and *in the name of her council*, That "thair
" had bene nathing sufficientlie producit nor
" schawin be thame aganis the Quene thair so-
" verane, QUHAIRBY the Quene of Ingland
" SOULD CONCEAVE OR TAK ONY EVIL OPI-
" NION OF THE QUENE, hir guid sister, for ony
" thing zit sene *."

Nor can this be considered, as equally a flourish of policy with that justification of Murray, which was pronounced at the same time and by the same lips. The latter runs in the following terms: "Thair has bene nathing deducit aganis
" thame as zit, that may impair thair honour or
" alledgeances †." This is evidently in a much

* Goodall, ii. 305.

† Ibid. *ibid.*

fainter tone, than the other. The circumstances also are totally different. Elizabeth would naturally be inclined to pay compliments to Murray, at the expence of truth. Her inclination lay just the contrary way towards Mary. She was likewise urged powerfully by the necessity of her affairs, to justify Murray in order to dismiss him. She had no such urgency from the side of Mary. And Mary had yet produced no evidence against Murray, while he had produced her own handwriting, as he pretended, against her. Under all these circumstances, the justification of Murray stands upon ground, totally different from the vindication of Mary. The latter indeed was plainly wrung from the hard and savage heart of Elizabeth, by the violence of her convictions, and the pressure of her affairs, uniting together at the time.

Elizabeth thus pronounced Mary, to be innocent from the charge brought against her. Elizabeth thus declared Mary's honour, to be no ways sullied by the imputations thrown out against her. She affirmed, that she had no reason "to conceive or take any evil opinion of her, "for any thing yet seen." This is the amplest vindication of Mary, that could possibly be given. It comes from her enemy, her political and her personal enemy. It comes from the confederate, the confidante, and the maintainer, of her usurping rebels. It comes from her, *after* she has been trafficking with them long in mischief, in forgery, and in every species of artful villainy. And it comes from her, even *after* she has heard
all

all their charge, and even *after* she has seen all their evidences of adultery and murder against her.

But did Elizabeth *restore* her after all? Mary is not only NOT found apparently guilty. The murder is not only NOT proved plainly and manifestly upon her. But she is even pronounced innocent and unfullied, by the mouth of her enemy and her judge; at the close of all, that this enemy and this judge would suffer to be transacted. She must therefore be certainly restored. She has a right to it, from the fundamental principles of the whole inquiry. She has a double right to it, from Elizabeth's full declaration of her innocence.

She may have a *right*. But she will not gain the *possession*. Elizabeth might be brought to *confess* a great truth at a particular moment, from the *violence* and *torture* of distress. Yet she is not one *iota* an honefter woman, than she has always been before. The grandest criminals have done the same, in similar circumstances. And, if instantly released from the rack, would *they* have begun to act honestly? Elizabeth had held out the lure of restoration, to draw Mary into the trial. She thought of it no more, when this was over. She not only did NOT restore her. She sent the usurper of her throne away, with a promise to maintain his authority, and with a *loan of five thousand pounds* to strengthen him in it*. She kept Mary in prison still. She kept

* Goodall, ii. 306 and 313.

her under a stricter confinement there. She thus left her rebels, to exult in the success of their confederacy with Elizabeth, and to triumph in the equal congeniality of Elizabeth's and their souls for mischief. And, in a few years afterward, she stepped out decisively from behind the line of artful profligacy, to which she had chiefly confined herself hitherto; became as violent now, as she had been perfidious before; so united the two extremes of human profligacy, in her own conduct; and wildly bathed her hands at last, in the life-blood of Mary.

§ VI.

THE murder of Mary by Elizabeth, is too well known to the publick in all its *accompanying* circumstances. But there is a chain of circumstances *preparatory* to it, which is little known. These either led to the murder distantly, or preceded it immediately. And, as I am now drawing near to a close in my history of Elizabeth's conduct to Mary, I mean to lay them before my reader here; in order to point the enormity of her conduct, with a greater force to his feeling.

For that purpose, let us first observe those distant gradations of guilt, by which she began to ascend towards the murder. The first step in the ascent, was made at the opening of this conference. Then she promised Murray, as I have shown before, *if* Mary should be found guilty; that she should *either* be kept in an English prison for life, *or* be delivered up into the hands of Murray himself; and that, if she was
delivered.

delivered up, Murray should give “sufficient
 “sureties and assurances, for *the safety of her life,*
 and *good usage of her* *.” But, in a few months
 afterward, her language became more sanguinary
 and savage. In the spring of 1570 those rebel
 chiefs, who took upon themselves the sovereignty
 of Scotland, on the assassination of Murray, sent
 the abbot of Dumferling to London; in order
 to get Mary out of Elizabeth’s hands, and into
 their own. He came, waited on Elizabeth, and
 requested the delivery of Mary. “Whereto,”
 says Melvill in a very curious passage, “the
 “Queen of England made answer: If they would
 “find her *sufficient pledges for the security of the*
 “*Queen’s life,* she would deliver her to be kept
 “by them.” Mary had now been, as I have
 just shown, *not* found guilty; and had even been
acquitted of all guilt, by the voice of Elizabeth
 herself, speaking in her prime-minister. Yet Eli-
 zabeth still persisted in her plan, of delivering her
 up. This plan was conditional before, and on the
 supposition of her guilt; but is absolute now, and
 even after the acknowledgment of her innocence.
 Nor is it *now* suspended upon the alternative, of
either delivering her up, *or* keeping her in an En-
 glish prison. No! It is peremptory for deliver-
 ing her up. Nor does it *now* include any stipu-
 lations, for the “good usage of her.” It con-
 fines itself wholly to her *life*. And the only simi-
 larity between the present and the former plan, is
 this; that Elizabeth still requires “sufficient sure-

* Chap. ii. sect. 4.

“ties and assurances, for the safety of her *life*.” So much more brutal was the present plan, than the former! So hastily was Elizabeth mounting up in malignity, against the innocent Mary! But she appears to be even *more* so, at this very moment. “The abbot alledged,” says Melvill, about putting in pledges for the security of Mary’s life; “*that* would be hard to do, for what in case “the Queen *dye* in the mean time?” To this let my reader particularly observe Elizabeth’s answer. “She answered,” adds Melvill: “My “LORD, I BELIEVED YOU HAD BEEN A WISE “MAN; YOU WOULD PRESS ME TO SPEAK, “WHAT IS NOWAYS NECESSARY; YOU MAY “KNOW, THAT I CANNOT BUT FOR MY HO- “NOUR REQUIRE PLEDGES FOR THAT END; I “THINK YOU MAY JUDGE ALSO OF YOURSELF, “WHAT MIGHT BE BEST FOR ME*.” This horrible address, which is very similar to some addresses that Shakespeare has given us, in the artful obscurity of suggestion, and in the intimated meaning of murder; must place Elizabeth for ever conspicuous, in the rank of human murderers. Yet, in a short time, she pushed beyond this line of malignity, and fixed herself in the fore-front of this infernal host.

She who had *at first* promised, if Mary should be found guilty, to keep her confined in England, or, on receipt of hostages for her life and good usage, to deliver her up to her rebels of Scotland; and who had *afterwards* agreed to deliver

* Melvill, 106—107.

her up, when confessed to be innocent, on receiving hostages for security of her life only, and yet in full expectation and hope, that her life would still be taken away: even she, in seventeen or eighteen months after the second agreement, *came forward herself* to the rebels, *invited* them to ask for Mary, and *offered* to give her up; *not* on receipt of hostages for the safety of her life, and with the secret expectation and hope of having it taken away; *but* with *the express stipulation* made by *her*, and with *the express requisition* of hostages from *them*, that her life *should* be taken away by them. This appears from a murderous letter of instructions to an ambassador, drawn up in *Cecil's own hand*, and dated September the 10th, 1572; which was published about thirty years ago, from Cecil's own papers, and which nothing short of the grand day of doom should ever have brought to light, either against Cecil or against his Queen. "It seemeth better," says the letter, "that she
" [Mary] be sent into Scotland, to be delivered
" to the Regent [the Earl of Mar] and his party;
" so as it may be by some good meanes wrought,
" that *they themselves* wold secretly require it;
" and that *good assurance may be gyven*, that as
" they have heretofore many tymes, specially in
" the tyme of the Quene's formar Regents, of-
" fered, so they wold *without fayle proceed with*
" *hir by wey of justice*, so as nether *that* realme
" nor *this* shuld be dangered by *hir* hereafter."
" They might have hir," it adds, "so as there
" might be *good suerty gyven*, that she *shuld re-*
" *ceave that she hath deserved ther*, by ordre of
" justice;

“justice; wherby *no furdher perill shuld ensue—*.
 “For, *otherwise*, yow may well saye that the
 “counsell of England *will never assent*, to deliver
 “hir out of the realme; and *for assurance* none
 “can suffice, but *hostages of good vallew*, that is,
 “*some children and nere kynsfolk of the Regent and*
 “*the Erle Morton**.” This is certainly one of the
 most extraordinary dispatches, that the villainy of
 man, and the instigation of the devil, ever united
 to produce. It will be exhibited, I *fear*, as a
damning proof of iniquity against the Queen and
 her minister, in the general moments of deter-
 mination for eternity. And it dreadfully concurs
 with the two papers preceding, to mark distinctly
 the degrees upon the scale of iniquity, along
 which Elizabeth proceeded to the last enormity of
 her conduct towards the person of Mary; from
 her intimation to Murray, from her insinuation to
 the abbot, and from her offer to the Earl of Mar,
 to the murder of Mary by her own subjects, by
 her own servants, and by her own commands †.

Let us now proceed, therefore, to mark the
 workings of her mind minutely, in the very mo-
 ments of murder. These present to us a picture,
 still more striking in its disposition and colouring.
 And it is additionally necessary to be dwelt upon,
 in order to show Elizabeth still farther to the
 world, in all the savage movements of her mur-
 derous spirit.

* Murdin, 224—225.

† This paper, one of the most memorable in all Murdin's
 collection, was first pointed out to the publick notice by
 Mr. Tytler, in p. 348—352, edit. 3d.

Having,

Having “many hundred times” declared her resolution “to pursue Mary’s death,” she ordered the warrant to be made out, for the execution of her. She kept it in Secretary Davison’s hands no less than five or six weeks afterward. Yet her sanguinary spirit relented not, in all this interval of time. In the course of it, indeed, she found Davison never *offered* to *present* her the warrant for her subscription to it. She was obliged to give him an order for bringing it. Yet he still neglected to produce it. On the morning of WEDNESDAY therefore, the first of February 1586-7, her spirit, which had been kindling and burning all the time, at last flamed out. She expressed herself with sharpness against him, to the Lord Admiral Howard. She sent him a peremptory command by this nobleman, to bring the warrant immediately to her. She was now determined to sign it immediately. The Lord Admiral carried the command, and the secretary attended her with the warrant. But, though he was come on such a solemn business, though she knew he was, and though she had sent for him expressly and peremptorily upon it; she could begin with indifferent points of conversation, and could instantly enter into talk with him about the weather, about his health, and about his riding-exercise. On his coming in, as he tells us himself in vindication of his own conduct, she asked him, whether he had been abroad that fair morning. She advised him to go abroad more frequently than he did; and she reprehended him for going so seldom. And she then inquired of him what papers he had in his hands. So coolly could she proceed in those moments,

moments of solemnity, in which the soul of any other woman, surely, must have been agonizing alternately with tenderness and with terror!

On the secretary's saying that he had some warrants and other papers, to be signed for her service; she calmly inquired, whether he had not received a message from her, and whether he had not brought the warrant for the Queen of Scots. He answering yes, she calmly called for the warrant. She received it from him. She read it over, without one symptom of emotion. Without one symptom of emotion she called for her pen and ink. Without one symptom of emotion she signed it. She then laid it a little from her, and could be *more than calm* concerning it. She could be *savagely jocular* about it. She could ask the secretary, whether he "were not heartily sorry it "was done."

She then commanded him to carry it to the chancellor; for having the great seal affixed to it. She directed him to tell the chancellor, that it was to be used with all possible secrecy. And she could be savagely jocular about it, again. She could tell him to shew it, as he went towards the chancellor's, to the other secretary, Walsingham, who was then sick; "because," as she said, "she "thought the grief thereof would kill him out- "right."

She addressed herself very composedly after all, to the official business before her. She called for the other warrants and papers. She received them successively. She successively signed them. And she "dispatched them all," says her very se-

cretary himself, “with the best disposition and
“willingness that might be.”

Yet, in the intervals of this business, she could be dwelling upon the execution of Mary. She could be declaring her reasons, for having deferred the signature so long. She had deferred it for the sake of her honour, she said; that the world might see, she had not been hurried into it by violence or malice. But she had always been so well advised, she added, as to apprehend her own danger from Mary, and to see the necessity for her execution. She could afterwards divert at times, to other subjects. She could tell him in the midst of them, however, and tell him again after the conclusion of them; that she would have the execution performed with all possible secrecy. She even intimated her dislike, to have it performed in the open court or green of Fotheringay castle. She expressly declared, that it should be performed in the hall there. She could thus go in her mind, over one of the main circumstances of the bloody act. She could rest upon it. And she could determine with a sanguinary accuracy, whether the green or the hall should be the actual scene of the execution.

The secretary gathering up his papers, and being ready to retire; she began to open a new fund of murderfulness, that the baseness of her nature, or the degeneracy of her spirit, had lodged in the more secret cells of her soul. She began to complain of Mary's keepers, “Sir Amias Paulet and
“others;” because they had not ASSASSINATED Mary for her. They “might have eased her,”
she

she cried, “of this burthen.” Such a very murderous wretch was she! She even expressed her wishes, that he should talk to the other secretary; and that both should unite in a letter to Sir Amias, and to his colleague Sir Drue Drury, in order to sound their disposition for this execrable work of assassination. She wished the murder *so* to be “done, as *the blame might be removed from herself.*” And she thus spoke with all the flagitious cunning of the “Devilish Macbeth” himself. Mary, she cried in *his* language, is mine enemy,

And in such bloody distance,
That every minute of her being thrusts
Against my near’st of life; and though I could
With barefac’d power sweep her from my sight,
And bid my will avouch it, yet I must not
. [always thought
That I require a clearness]; but *wail her fall*
Whom I myself struck down. And thence it is,
That I to their assistance do make love,
Masking the business from the common eye.

This plan of murdering Mary by the hands of others, we have already seen pursued by her towards the Scotch, with great ardour before. But, when that finally failed, she turned her thoughts from a formal execution by Mary’s rebels in Scotland, to a private assassination of her by some of her English ruffians. She had made “fundry motions” of this kind *before*, to the secretary who informs us of all. But, as he utterly condemned them, he had always refused to have any concern with them. Yet she could renew the motion to him now. So perseveringly steady was she, in her purpose of assassinating Mary! Her secretary however was now “content,” he

told her, to take such a concern in the business, as, “for her satisfying, to let Sir Amias know what she expected at his hands.” Yet he was sure, he added, that it would be useless; as he knew too well the character of Sir Amias and Sir Drue, their wisdom and their integrity, to suppose they would do an unlawful deed for any respect in the world. But she still persisted in her purpose, to have them founded for the assassination. Nor did she suffer her secretary to depart, before he had promised to call upon the other secretary, to signify her pleasure to him, and to unite with him in a letter to the keepers. And then she dismissed him, with another caution given by her, and with another promise made by him; that the matter should be managed with all possible secrecy, because of her danger.

In the *afternoon* of *that very day*, the secretary called upon his brother-secretary about the letter, and settled with him the form of it. He then left him to draw it up, while he went on to the chancellor's. There he procured the great seal to be fixed to the warrant. He returned to the other secretary's office. And the letter was signed by both, and dispatched away to Sir Amias.

The *next morning*, which was THURSDAY, the secretary received a letter from his servant, whom he had left at court; signifying Elizabeth's pleasure to him, not to go to the chancellor before she had spoken to him again. Within an hour after the receipt of this, Mr. William Killigrew came to him, with a direct message of the same import from Elizabeth. This prohibition, and
this

this earnestness about it, concur to carry a very favourable appearance for Elizabeth. Her heart is at last touched with some compunctions of pity. The obdurate barbarian in her, is at last brought to some feeling of humanity. And she will not permit the bloody warrant, to be finally prepared for execution. But alas! we find ourselves dreadfully disappointed. The obdurate barbarian is *not* brought to any feeling of humanity. Her heart is *not* touched with any compunctions of pity. And she is only moving by another direction, to her execrable purpose of *assassination*.

The secretary sent word by Killigrew, that he should be at court as soon as he; and that he would then give her Majesty an account, of what he had done. He came. She asked him, whether he had been with the chancellor. He replied, he had. She demanded, what need there was of so much haste in him. He told her, that he had done no more than what she ordered, and that he himself thought it not a matter to be trifled with. But “methinks,” she replied, “the best and “safest way for me, is to have it *otherways* handled.” She even “particularized a form.” *This*, she said, she liked better. And she actually *named* some persons, who were of that opinion; and whose judgment in such cases she commended. *Whom* she named, we can only conjecture, as Davison has thought it prudent to suppress their names. But this very suppression unites with the whole case, to point them *exactly* out for *some of her ministers*. They were some too, to whom she could unbosom herself with peculiar openness,

and on whose judgment she could rely with peculiar confidence; some therefore, that were congenial to herself, in all the ferocious and savage qualities of the heart; Cecil, Walsingham, and Leicester*. She was thus bending eagerly to the assassination. She thought, upon re-considering what she had said the day before, that the keepers of Mary would *not* do the deed of murder for her. She therefore wanted to have it done by *others*. And yet her secretary answering, that in his opinion the best and safest way was by an execution, if she meant to have Mary put to death at all; she made no answer to him, but left him abruptly, and went to her dinner.

The very next day, FRIDAY, she called her secretary to her, in her privy chamber; and recounted to him a dream, which she had had the night before, and which had agitated her soul violently while it lasted. She dreamed, that the Queen of Scots was actually executed, by his sending the warrant away; that she herself was greatly troubled, at the thought; and that, if she had had a sword in her hand at the time, she could have stabbed him to the heart with it. She was thus the female barbarian, even in her dream of penitence. But this was enough to have beaten her off for ever, from *all* her resolutions of murder against Mary. Yet she, who could defy the terrors of eternity in her waking thoughts, was

* See the sequel. Walsingham, vol. ii. ch. 6. sect. 3. for Walsingham and Leicester, and App. No. xvi. for Cecil and both.

not to be disconcerted by the troubles of her sleeping hours. She could begin to speak to him upon the subject, “smiling.” And she could even recount the whole to him, “in a pleasant and “smiling manner.” This should have served, however, to shew the secretary before-hand, all that oppressive conduct, which she practised towards him afterwards. Yet he answered at first, with a reflected ray of her jocularities; that it was happy for him he was not near her, whilst this fit of resentment against him lasted. But then, more deeply considering her alarming account, he asked her in great earnestness, what all this meant; and whether, when she had proceeded thus far, she had no design to go on with the execution. And her answer was Yes, uttered with some vehemency, and confirmed with a solemn oath.

But she had still all her former hankerings after assassination. With a view to this, she had introduced the conversation at first. With the same view she now added, *again*, that “she “thought it might receive a better form; because, saith she, this casteth the whole burthen “upon myself:”

. *always thought*
That I require a clearness.

The secretary *again* urged, that the form prescribed by the warrant was the only form in law, in honour, and in justice. She *again* answered, that wiser men than himself were of a different opinion. She thus hinted *again*, at some of her ministers being for the assassination of Mary; and some too, who were superiour to Davison in her estimation.

estimation. He “could not answer for other
“men,” he replied, “but this he was sure of,
“that he *never* heard any man give a sound rea-
“son,” for the honourableness or the safety of
any other form to her Majesty. So much had
the topick of assassinating Mary, been gravely
and formally *debated* by Elizabeth’s ministers *in*
her presence! So much were her ministers in ge-
neral for the assassination of Mary, though they
concurred with her in endeavours to throw the
act upon Davison! And Elizabeth, without fur-
ther reply or address, rose abruptly from her seat,
and went into another room.

In the *afternoon* of *this* day, she renewed the
murderous conversation with him. She was now
driven off from the assassination of Mary by *others*.
She was therefore willing to come back to the
hope, of an assassination by Paulet and Drury.
She asked him, whether he had heard from Paulet.
He replied in the negative. But going into the
city an hour or two afterwards, he found an an-
swer from him.

He therefore informed her the next morning,
the morning of SATURDAY, when he waited
upon her for some other business; and when now
the bloody warrant had been actually sent off the
evening before, in consequence of the letter from
Paulet, and by the whole privy council, Davison
himself being one of the number; that he had
received Paulet’s answer. She desired to read it
herself. She took and read it. And she found,
that the writer was grieved at the motion made to
him; that he offered his life, and his property,
to

to be disposed of by her Majesty ; but absolutely refused to be concerned, in the assassination of Mary. Drury did the same in a postscript to it. She broke out directly into terms of reproach, against Paulet. She complained of the *daintiness* of conscience, in him “and others.” She wildly taxed him and them with *perjury* ; because, in contradiction to their oath of association forsooth, they would not murder Mary themselves, but did throw the burden of the murder upon her. She then rose up abruptly from her seat, again. She took a turn or two across the room. And she retired again into another room.

This being a gallery, the secretary followed her into it. There she renewed her former strain of talking to him. She a second time blamed the *niceness* of those *precise* fellows, who would promise to do mighty things for her safety, but in reality would do nothing at all. She therefore concluded at last, to “have it done without “them.” She thus returned for the third time, to the plan of assassination by others. She now entered into *particulars* concerning it. And she even mentioned to him one *Wingfield* by name, as a man, that she was sure “would with some “others undertake it.” She thus appears to have formed and settled the whole plan of assassination, in concert with her other ministers. They had named to her the very person, who was proper to be the captain of the murderous gang. She remembered the name well. And her only aim, in concurrence with her other ministers, was this ; to put Davison upon employ-
ing

ing the captain and his gang, then to deny she had ever put him, and so to sacrifice him at once to her own Moloch-like hypocrisy. But her secretary had courage enough to point out, how dishonourable in his opinion any such course of proceeding would be; and how far off she would be from shunning the blame and disgrace by it, which she was so solicitous to avoid. He even entered into the case of Paulet and Drury, in order to vindicate them to her. It was a wonderful extremity of danger, he said, to which she would have exposed them both. If, from a tender anxiety for her safety, they had acted up to her inclinations; she must have either allowed or disallowed of their deed. If she allowed of it, she took the matter upon herself directly, to the infinite dishonour of her name. If she disallowed of it, she overthrew those faithful gentlemen entirely, who, she knew, did with truth and fidelity love her; and not only themselves, but all their fortunes and families too. Such a course, he thought therefore, was dangerous to herself, dangerous to them, and dishonourable to both. Yet he little suspected the accursed snare, that all the while was laid, not for them, but for himself. They would have pleaded the letter from the joint secretaries, in justification of the deed which they had done. Walsingham would have declared the authority upon which he wrote it, to be a message from the Queen by Davison. The Queen would have instantly denied, that she sent any such message by him. And Davison would have

have suffered that very ruin himself, of which he is here so generously apprehensive for them.

This introduced “some particular speech of “Mr. Secretary [Walsingham] and others, touching some matters past heretofore;” and concerning his and their suggestions to her, no doubt, to have Mary taken off privately, by the dagger or by the bowl *. But her Majesty finally liking Davison’s discourse this time, as little as she had liked it twice before; she called to her attendants in an adjoining apartment. She asked, if it was not time for her to go to the *closet*; for a murderer in intention and an assassin in deliberation, to go to publick prayers in her closet! And she thus broke off the conversation abruptly, for the *third* time.

At the secretary’s next access to her Majesty, which was TUESDAY, he thinks, and *the very day before the actual execution of Mary* under the warrant; he brought her some other papers for her signature, and she entered into fresh discourse with him upon the subject. But she had now been forced off, however reluctantly, from her natural bias for an assassination. The secretary *could* not induce her keepers to murder her. The secretary *would* not engage others to do the deed for her. None of those ministers too, who concurred with her in the project of assassination, would be concerned in the execution of it. Or, if they would, she did not *dare* to crush men in her intended hypocrisy afterwards, who had

* See vol. ii. ch. 6, sect. 3, and Appendix, No. xvi.

known so much of her flagitious counsels, and had acted so much in her iniquitous operations, as they had. And she therefore ran back, with all the violence of recoiling malignity, to the murder of Mary by her own authority. She now “entered *of herself* into some *earnest* discourse, “of the danger she daily lived in; and how *it* “*was more than time*, this matter was dispatched; “fswearing a great oath, that *it was a shame for* “*them all* it was not *already* done.” She therefore spoke to him, “to have a letter written *for* “*the dispatch thereof*; because, the longer it was “deferred, the more her danger encreased.” But her secretary, knowing all that had been done by the council, in sending away the warrant the Friday before, told her he saw no necessity for a letter, as the warrant itself was so large and ample. And her Majesty, when she heard this, made scarcely any other reply, than that she thought Paulet would look for a letter. So very anxious was she now, for the sure and certain murder of Mary under the sanction of her own writing!

All this presents us with such a history of a murderer’s mind, for seven days together, and at the critical period of the murder too; as the world never saw before. The Queen’s own left-handed policy, turned directly against herself; and occasioned this memorable delineation to be made, by the only man who could have made it. But it is wholly a delineation of horror. Not one ray of compassion sheds its light, over the eyes of this wretched woman. Not one flash of remorse throws its pleasingly frightful glare, across
the

the face of this royal murderer. A fullness of malice is sitting at the bottom of her eye-ball. A deep gloom of malignity is lowering on her brow. And her whole soul is so eagerly and violently bent upon the blood of Mary, that it determines to murder her immediately; that it only prefers *assassination*, as a more lurking act of murder, to more open murder by an *execution*; that it rests in execution at last, from mere necessity; that it still prefers assassination, by choice; and that it is only shifting and shuffling all the while, from one mode of murder to another*.

§ VII.

BUT to complete the parts of this enormous whole, for even these can receive an addition in order to their completeness; I must add one thing more. It is this. Not content to mangle the fine person of Mary with the murderous axe, Elizabeth even proceeded to a still greater excess of guilt. She exerted all the arts of Hell, to mangle her reputation also.

She had totally prevented Mary, from making any reply to the letters produced against her; by refusing her all sight of them at one time, and by closing abruptly the whole inquisition at another. Yet she herself had been compelled, at a particular moment, to pronounce the eulogium of her innocence. She acquitted her from every shade of dishonour, that had been so violently attempted

* See Appendix, No. xvi. for Davison's apology itself, and some notes to it.

to be thrown, over the lustre of her character by the letters. And, in less than three years afterwards, she *published those very letters*, in order to eclipse her character for ever. She published them, as *proofs of adultery*, and as *proofs of murder*, against her. She published them, as *proofs substantiated at the time*. And, with the malignant industry of the Arch-fiend himself, she circulated them over the island and over the continent.

This is such a crowning addition to all the flagitiousness of Elizabeth before, and gives her such a horrible pre-eminence in guilt; that justice ought not to believe it even of her, without a large share of evidence for it. This therefore shall be given. And it shall be fully given.

The original letters were now gone back, to their native north. But copies of them were still in London. They were only with Elizabeth, however. They had indeed been delivered to her commissioners. Yet in such a government as Elizabeth's, where the genius of the Queen, and the habits of the people, threw a controlling awe over all the departments of the state; they were properly still in the custody of Elizabeth. And in a few days after that delivery, as I have already shown, the very existence of the commissioners ceased, and all their papers would be then removed into Cecil's office. The letters were even delivered at first into, and ever afterwards continued in, the hands of Cecil himself, as at once a commissioner and the secretary. "The copies of all quhilk letteris," says Murray
in

in some instructions written about nine months afterwards, being “*conferrit, red, and confiderit, wer deliverit to Mr. Secretary, in quhais handis thay remane**.” So completely were they, from their first production before the commissioners, in the possession of Elizabeth and under the care of Cecil. But, from that possession and that care, they eloped to the press. She therefore ordered, and he executed, the publication of them.

Accordingly, Cecil himself appears particularly active in dispersing them, and in dispersing them even among the French, immediately after their publication here. In a letter of his to Walsingham, our embassadour in France, which is dated the 1st of November, 1571, he says thus to him: “*Having this present occasion to send two of my Lord of Oxford’s men to Paris, at his Lordship’s request; I thought good also therewith to send to you, THIS LITTLE TREATISE newly printed in Latin,*” Buchanan’s Detection, in which were inserted *some* of the principal letters, “*in commending or discommending the Queen of Scots actions to further her marriage with Bothwell.* I hear it is to be translated into English, with addition of many other supplements of like condition †.” For what purpose a copy of this new publication was sent by Cecil, is obvious enough of itself. But this is opened at large in another paper, which was equally sent in the same year to Elizabeth’s representative at

* Goodall, ii. 88.

† Ibid. i. 106.

Paris, and which contains some special instructions to him from Elizabeth, with regard to Mary. To many arguments which he was to use to the King of France, in order to dissuade him from taking part with the imprisoned Mary; it is added thus: “and here were it not amiss to have *divers* “ of BUCHANAN’S LITTLE LATIN BOOKS, to “ present, *if need be*, to the King as from *yourself*, “ and likewise to some of the other *noblemen of* “ *his council*; for THEY WILL SERVE TO GOOD “ EFFECT TO DISGRACE HER; which *must be* “ *done*, BEFORE *other purposes can be attained* *.” This letter, which, like a record of the last day, discloses the whole heart and soul of Elizabeth in the business, appears plainly from the tenour of it, to have been written *after* the other. The other speaks of the publication as recent. This passes over the circumstance, as not recent and well known. They evidently stand in a very near relation to each other. And this reflects a strong light back upon that. This also receives a light reflected back from a letter immediately subsequent, and so appears to have been written, like that, in the month of November, and while there was only a *Latin* edition of Buchanan’s book yet published.

But says Cecil in his *former* letter, for he was, no doubt, the author of both, though he does not *appear* to be so: “I hear it is to be translated into English, with addition of many “ other supplements of like condition.” It was

* Goodall, Introd. 25.

accordingly

accordingly published in English, within *three or four weeks* afterwards. And some of the “supplements of like condition,” were the rest of the letters. These therefore must have been, equally with the other letters, all published by Elizabeth and Cecil. He, we see, knew of the intention and plan, before it was executed. It was executed immediately, and in that very month of November. We have a letter written at Leith in Scotland, on the 14th of December in that year; which speaks of the work, as having been *then* published in England. “Thay have set out in Ingland,” says the author, “and newlie set out,” he adds in another place, “our Quene’s lyfe and proces, *baith* in *Latin* and *Inglish*; quhair-in is contenit the discourse of hir tragical doingis, the proces of the Erle of Bothwell’s clenging,” cleansing or acquittal, “hir sonnettis and letteris to him, the depositionis of the persounis execute, and cartellis efter the King’s murther. In appearance THAY LEIVE NATHING UNSET OUT, TENDING TO HIR INFAMIE, and to mak the Duke of Northfolk odious, quha has a grait benevolence of the people *.” To the Latin edition of the Detection, were subjoined only the three first letters. To the English, were annexed these three letters; *before* them, the second contract of marriage, the trial and acquittal of Bothwell for the murder, and the sonnets in French and Scotch; and *after* them the five other letters, the tickets

* Goodall, ii. 371 and 373.

stuck up on Bothwell's acquittal, the confessions of Hepburn, Hay, Dalgleshe, and Powry, and some concluding exclamations against Mary *. But that stroke concerning the Duke of Norfolk, shows us still more plainly, whence the English publication was derived. He had been convinced of the scandalous measures into which he had been trepanned against Mary. He wished to make her some reparation. He wished to deliver her from the cursed bonds, and still more cursed machinations, of that MACHIAVELL IN A RUFF AND FARTHINGALE, Elizabeth. But he was over-reached by men, who, to his honour be it spoken, were more versed than himself in the wiles of policy. And he lay at this moment under sentence of death, for his conduct. To turn away the affection of the people from this popular noble, by loading the name of Mary with various enormities, and by involving him in all the imputed infamy of Mary; appears to have been the design of the publication.

For that reason, Cecil prefixed to it an inflammatory address against her, and added to it an inflammatory comparison betwixt her and Elizabeth. The former says, that in this “ booke are
“ BOTH parties to be heard; the one [Mary] in
“ the former part, both in the *declaration* and
“ *oration of evidences* ;” these names being here,

* See the Latin in Jebb, i. 237—277; and the English in Anderson, ii. 1—162. The latter is taken from the first edition in Scotland, yet is the same as the English (Goodall, i. 37—38).

from their double nature, applied to the two parts of Buchanan's Detection, when in reality they belong only to the second part of it, which is entitled "ane oratioun with declaratioun of evidences;" "the other in the latter part, in the parties own contractes, songes, letteres," &c. "The booke itself," it adds, "with the oration of evidence, is written in Latin by a learned man of Scotland, Mr. George Buchanan.—It was also overseen, and allowed, and exhibited by them," the Lords of the privie council of Scotland, "as mater that thay have offered, and *do continue in offeryng*, TO STAND TO AND JUSTIFIE, before our Soveraigne Ladie, or hir Highnesses commissiouners in that behalfe appointed. And what PROFE thay have made of it already, when thay were here for that purpose, and the sayd authour of the sayd booke one among them; when BOTH PARTIES, or their sufficient procurators, were here present INDIFFERENTLIE to be heard, and so WERE HEARD INDEEDE : all *good* subjects may *easely* gather, be our said Soveraigne Ladye's procedyng sins the said hearyng of the cause; who *no doubt* would *never have so stayed her*," Mary's "request; but rather would have added enforcement, by *ministring of ayde to the Lady Mary of Scotland, for her restitution* *." So shamelessly confident were Elizabeth and Cecil, in asserting both parties to have been heard in the inquisition, and both to have been heard impartially; and in

* Goodall, ii. 377, and i. 39.

resting finally the proof of convicted guilt in Mary, on the very perfidiousness of Elizabeth to her.

But both the address and the comparison went on, in a higher unison of malignity, to do that “which was to be done, before other purposes could be attained.” The address therefore says, that “of late hath bene published—a treatise, *detecting* the FOULE DOYINGES of some,” Mary, “THAT HAVE BENE DAUNGEROUS TO OUR NOBLE QUENE: by which *detection* is induced a very excellent comparison, for all Englishmen to judge, whether it be good to chaunge QUENES or no; and therewith a necessary enforcement to every honest man, to pray heartely for the long continuance of our good mother to rule over us, that our posteritie may not see her place left empty for a PERILOUS STEPDAME*.” But the comparison spoke out in much stronger terms than these. It spoke thus: “Now judge, Englishmen, gif it be gude to change QUENES, O uniting, confounding! When rude Scotland has VOMITED A POYSOUNE, must fyne England lick it up for a restorative? O vyle indignitie! WHILES YOUR QUENE’S ENEMY LIVETH, *hir* DANGER CONTINEWETH. Desperat necessitie will dar the uttermost. O ambitione! fed with prosperitie, nourished with indulgence, *irritate with adversitie*, not to be NEGLECTED, TRUSTED, NOR PARDONIT †.” So outrageously abusive were Elizabeth and Cecil

* Goodall, ii. 376.

† Ibid. 373—374.

against Mary, when they could throw out their abuse under the cover of a mask, and when they wanted, for their “other purposes,” to set the nation against her*.

Elizabeth was thus busy in completing HER own infamy, while she was labouring for Mary's. She had plotted to ruin Mary's character. She had tried a thousand frauds, for that purpose. Yet she had been compelled, in her own despite, to acknowledge the innocence which she had endeavoured to disprove. And then she returned with a double portion of malignity, to her original purpose; published the papers as genuine, which she had plainly owned to be spurious before; and arraigned, tried, and condemned that Queen in print, whom she had found herself forced to acquit with honour, upon the real trial. She thus became the polluted mother of a long brood of evils. She prepared the way with too fatal a success, for her “other purposes.” She became *her own seducer and leader into murder*. She became the wretched cause of worse. With an equally fatal success, she buried the reputation and honour of Mary, under the rubbish of her own accusations. And she now stands forward in the eye of reason and religion, as the grand authour

* See also a discourse concerning the intended marriage of Mary to the Duke of Norfolk, written in the same strain of impudent abuse, and written, no doubt, equally by Cecil; as it was sent in MS, and before publication, to Elizabeth's agent in Scotland, the factious and unprincipled Randolph (Anderson, i. 21—32, and the editor's preface to the Defence of Q. Mary's Honour, p. 111).

of all the calumnies upon calumnies, that have been heaped by a continual succession of slanderers on the head of Mary, for two centuries past.

She did not indeed foresee the amazing extent of her crimes, at the time. Nor do any criminals foresee the extent of theirs. Like Elizabeth, they look not beyond the present moment. They reflect not, that there is a *venom* in iniquity, which runs farther than the line of human life; which *corrodes* and *festers*, when the heart that dictated and the hand that executed it, are both crumbled into dust; and which continues to *burn* on, to other ages, and to other worlds. And let me in the proper sentiments of Christianity add, that the soul of Elizabeth at this instant, whether it is confined in the mansions of misery, or lodged among the spirits of the blessed, is looking back, I doubt not, to all her long transactions with Mary, and their longer consequences; either with a solemn sigh of penitence over them, or with the pangs and groans of an overwhelming remorse for them.

CHAPTER IV.

§ I.

THIS long and useful dissection of Elizabeth's and of Murray's conduct, in the exhibition of the letters; proves in the fullest manner the lively conviction, that they mutually had upon their minds, concerning the forgery of them. They both very plainly knew them to be forged. They were both apprehensive of a detection. And they took such extraordinary measures as they did, in order to prevent it. This appears stamped in the strongest characters, upon the forehead of the whole. Not merely one, or two, or three of the facts preceding, carry this striking signature upon them; but all. All bear the records of their own shame with them. And they all concur in one uniform attestation of infamy, against themselves, against the letters, against the doers of those, and against the employers of these.

Well therefore might the principal persons in England, at the conclusion of the conference, form that decisive opinion of Mary's innocence, which they plainly appear to have formed. Mr. Tytler was the first, who noticed the fact. He inferred it very justly, from the large and powerful confederacy among them, for the marriage of Mary to the Duke of Norfolk *. But we need

* P. 62—64. edit. 3.

not rest the point upon an inference. We have a cotemporary authority for it. We have it even, with an addition of evidence and energy. And “the nobles of England, that were appointed to heare and examine al such matters, as the rebels should lay against the Quene,” says the Bishop of Ross, only a few months after the hearing and examination were ended; “have not onely FOUND THE SAID QUEENE INNOCENT, AND GUILTLESS, OF THE DEATH OF HER HUSBAND; but doe withal FULLY UNDERSTAND, that her ACCUSERS were the very CONTRIVERS, DEVISERS, PRACTITIONERS, and WORKERS of the said murther; and have further also *so much encreased, and in such wise renewed the good estimation, and great hope, thay alwaies had of her,* NOW PERFECTLY KNOWING HER INNOCENCY, and therto moved THROUGH OTHER PRINCELY QUALITIES RESPLENDENT IN HER, with many whereof she is much adorned and singularly endowed; THAT THAY HAVE IN MOST EARNEST WISE SOLICITED AND ENTREATED, that she might be RESTORED AGAINE TO HER HONOUR AND CROUNE. Thay have MOVED THE SAID QUEENE OF SCOTLAND also, that it may please her TO ACCEPT AND LIKE OF THE MOST NOBLEST MAN OF ALL ENGLAND; between whome and her there might be a marriage concluded, to the quieting and comfort of both the realmes of England and Scotland. Finally, the noblemen of this our realme ACKNOWLEDGE AND ACCEPT HER, FOR THE VERY TRUE AND RIGHT HEIR APPARENT OF

“ THIS

“ THIS REALME OF ENGLAND; being fully
 “ minded and alwaies ready (when God shall so
 “ dispose) TO RECEIVE AND SERVE HER, AS
 “ THAIR UNDOUBTED QUENE, MAISTRESSE, AND
 “ SOVERAIGNE : whereby it may easely appeare,
 “ HOWE WEL THAY LIKE OF HER CAUSE, THAT
 “ HAD THE HEARING AND TRIAL OF THE
 “ SAME; although thay never as yet came in her
 “ presence*.” So says also the Duke of Norfolk
 himself, “ that her [Elizabeth’s] COUNSEL for
 “ the MOST part thought it [the marriage] veary
 “ fit and expedient to be done; and that the
 “ HOLE nobility ABROD lyked wele of it, few ex-
 “ cepted; for he had assayed all their myndis †.”
 Nor is this merely the language of Mary, and of
 Mary’s friends. An enemy says as much. In
 a letter to Lethington, of July 20, 1569, speak-
 ing to him of his “ Queen’s restoration and mar-
 “ riage to the Duke of Norfolk,” Throgmorton
 says thus : “ Sure I am, you do not judge so
 “ slenderly of the managing of this matter, as to
 “ think WE have not cast the worst; or to enter
 “ therein so far, without the assistance of the no-
 “ bility, the ABLEST, the WISEST, and the
 “ MIGHTIEST of this realm ‡.” The discernment
 of a nation, that seems in all ages to have had
 a strong principle of good-sense alive and active
 within it, could not but mark the wriggling
 movements of guilt in Elizabeth and in Murray,
 during the whole of this memorable inquiry;

* P. 80—81. Anderson, i.

† Appendix, No. xxii. and Murdin, 44.

‡ Robertson, ii. 395.

could not but despise the Sovereign, whom they were obliged to obey; and could not but revere the Queen, whom they had been compelled to persecute. And they appear to have seen and felt all this so strongly, that they very earnestly solicited Elizabeth, to restore the injured Queen to her crown; even urged Mary to marry Norfolk, for the eventual union of the two kingdoms; and professed themselves ready and resolute, on the demise of Elizabeth, to acknowledge Mary, as they actually acknowledged her son, for the rightful Sovereign of both*.

Nor

* So Mary, in a letter written at the moment, and dated Jan. 5, 1568-9, says thus: "The said Quene, our guid
" sister, and hir counsal, knaw thair fals inventiounis and
" offences practisit aganis us, to cullour thair traisoun and
" wickit usurpation; swa that it fall be manifest to all the
" world quhat men thay ar, to our honour, and contentment
" of our faythful subjectis. For, *praysit be God, our friendis*
" *increffis, and thairis decreffis, daylie.*" Goodall, ii. 315.
" I affeir yow one my lyff and honor," adds Lord Boyd on
the last of the same month, "yat the Quenis our Soveranis
" caus wes *nevir so liklie*, sen the begynnyng of your troublis,
" *to cum shortlie to ane guid succes*, to all our confortis yat is
" hir Majestie's faythfull subjectis; *as the samyne is at yis pre-*
" *sent*" (Haynes, 507). And see also Leslie's Negotiations,
50—52, 55, 58, and 62, Anderson, ii.

Norfolk seems to have been *actually married* to Mary. Her manly and judicious agent, Morgan, for whose person Elizabeth offered *ten thousand pounds* (Murdin, 472), says thus to her concerning Norfolk's eldest son, then Earl of Arundel, in 1586: "Perhaps there has passed between your Ma-
" jesty and his father, *some other occasions to terme the said*
" *Erle in another sort*; which I must leave to your Majesty's
" wise consideration" (Murdin, 504—505). And in some letters of Mary's to Norfolk, which are still preserved, she
subscribes

Nor does the evidence of the forgery, arising from the apprehensiveness of detection, end here. The same principle of cautious policy equally shows itself, in another part of the history of these letters. Murray, who acted with so much of the timourousness of guilt about him, while he was co-operating with Elizabeth, acted just in the same manner, when he was left entirely to his own operations. He was equally then a knave, fearful of detection, and guarding against it. And he equally betrayed his knavery, by that very fearfulness and those very guards.

The letters were not constantly in the publick eye, from the period of their first appearance before it. They were seen. They disappeared. They appeared again. But, in almost every one of these absences, the comet, though asserted to be the same, still presented a different face to the world. And there was a real alteration at almost every return, in the form or in the substance of these redoubted writings. This could not have been the case, if the writings had been authentick. They could never have varied in their form. They could never have changed in their substance. They must have appeared, and have been, exactly the same; from the first moment of their exhibition, to the last. The principle of identity within them, must have given them an

subscribes herself "your own, faithful to death, Queen of Scots," and, "my Norfolk, your own Queen" (Hardwicke, i. 194, Miscellaneous Remarks on the Enquiry into the evidence against Mary Queen of Scots, 1784, p. 37. See ch. v, sect. 4. &c. hereafter, for the latter work).

uniformity

uniformity of look and aspect, in all the different stages of their existence. This indeed they *might* equally have had, if they had been merely forgeries. But they would be sure to have had it, if they had been really genuine. And, only as forgeries, could they have been capable of any variation at all.

It is a very singular circumstance in the genius of guilt, that it is ever apprehensive of discovery, ever endeavouring to secure itself against it, and ever discovering itself by the act. This is as striking in itself, as it is happy in its consequences for man. Honesty stands firm upon its own unfailing basis. It dreads not exposure. It shows not solicitude. It uses not any preventive arts. But villainy is continually shifting its ground. It is always haunted with suspicions, always on the watch for dangers, and always strengthening itself against them. And thus is it disclosing its dangers, its suspicions, and its villainy, to an attentive eye. The coward provokes the attack, by preparing so timourously for it. The serpent points out the most vulnerable part of his body, by covering it so cautiously with the rest. The villain never thinks himself secure, while he has time for securing himself still more. He will "make surety doubly sure." He will "take a bond of fate" itself, for his own preservation. And he will betray himself completely by all. So Murray acted. He had the letters forged. He then had them corrected. One alteration was succeeded by another. The letters progressively put on a variety of faces, under his reforming hand,

hand. And thus did he as loudly proclaim the forgery of them to the ear of reason, as if he had told it by the mouth of a herald and the sound of a trumpet.

Many of the changes, which the letters underwent in this manner, are undoubtedly lost to our knowledge, from the want of minute exactness in the original records concerning them. But there are several, that are very distinguishable at present, and which I shall bring forth into view. And for that purpose I shall trace these “children of the mind,” from the first and earliest notice which we have of them, and from the first speck of life which we can discover in them, the *punctum saliens* of their existence; to their full maturity of manhood, at the final exhibition in London.

§ II.

THE first point to be ascertained in the history of these remarkable writings, is the grand æra of their original appearance to the world. This the rebels have fixed, to be the period of their own discovery of them. But the one is very different from the other. And the rebels give us this collective account of both.

In 1567, and on *June 20*, says a journal of their fabrication, which I shall particularly dwell upon hereafter; “DALGLEISHE, chalmer-child
“ [chamberlain] to my Lord Bothwell, wes takin;
“ and THE BOX AND LETTERIS, quhilk he brought
“ out of the CASTELL. About this tyme, my
“ Lord Buthwell fled be sea to the north*.”

* Appendix, No. x.

This article in the journal, is of considerable importance to us. It settles the precise day of the discovery. It therefore presents a fair mark, for the shafts of criticism. But it wants in circumstantiality, what it gains in precision. It was plainly drawn up, some time after the fact specified. It therefore refers in such a tone of familiarity, to the antecedent ideas of the reader; speaking only of “*the box and letters* ;” and thinking it unnecessary to particularize, what letters and what box were meant by the words. And accordingly, as I shall shew in the sequel, it did not make its appearance in publick, till EIGHTEEN OR NINETEEN MONTHS afterward, even till the time of the second conference in England. But, from the *oral traditions* of the rebels at these two conferences, the Bishop of Ross has informed us of one important circumstance, additional to the account in the journal. “It is forsooth,” he cries out with a manly disdain at the alledged discovery, “A BOX OF LETTERS, taken from one “DOUGLEYSH, who was executed for the Lord “Darleys death, the Earles man forsooth; which “letters he RECEIVED at Edenborough, of one “SIR JAMES BALFOURE*.” And Buchanan has dilated both these accounts, into this full and circumstantial history. “Memorandum,” he says at the end of his Detection, “that in the CASTELL “of Edinburgh thair WAS LEFT BE THE ERLE “BOTHWELL, befoir his fleing away,” about June the 20th, as in the journal above; “and was

* Leslie's Defence, 6. Anderson, i.

“ SEND [sent] FOR be one GEORGE DAGLISCHE
 “ his fervand, quha WAS TAKIN BE THE ERLE
 “ OF MORTOUN; ane small gylt coffer, not fully
 “ ane foot long, being garnischit in findrie places
 “ with the Roman letter F. under ane Kingis
 “ crowne,” as having belonged to the Queen’s
 late husband, Francis; “ quhairin wer certane let-
 “ teris and wrytingis, weill knawin, and be aithis
 “ [oaths] to be affirmit, to have bene written
 “ with the Quene of Scottis awin hand to the
 “ Erle Bothwell*.” But this history, like the
 account before, was not given till long after the
 event. It was not given in the original MS. of
 the Detection, or in the Latin publication of it †.”
 It was not given before the English publication
 in the end of November, 1571; nearly two
 YEARS AND A HALF, after the date of the asserted
 fact.

We have however another account of this pre-
 tended discovery. It is earlier in its date. Yet
 it is not nearly cotemporary with the fact. It is
 not within any moderate distance of time from it;
 being not earlier than the 16th of September,
 1568. And it is therefore, though the earliest that
 the rebels have formally chosen to give us, not less
 than FIFTEEN MONTHS posteriour to the event
 itself. It is contained in Murray’s receipt to the
 privy council, for “ ane silver box owergilt, [over-
 “ gilt] with gold, with all missive letteris,” &c.;

* Detection, 92, Anderson, ii. In Hist. xix. 374, this
 coffer is expressly said to have been, “ quam, à Francisco
 “ priore marito acceptam, Regina Bothuelio dederat.”

† See Jebb, i. 169—170.

“ quhilk

“ quhilk box, and haill [whole] pecis within the
 “ famyn, were takin and fund with umquhill
 “ GEORGE DALGLEISCHE, servand to the said
 “ Erle Bothvile, upon THE XX. DAY OF JUNII,
 “ ye zeir of God 1567 zeiris*.” This presents
 us with the earliest notice that we have from the
 rebels, of Dalgleishe’s concern in the carriage of
 the letters. But, even *then*, Dalgleishe had been
dead nearly NINE months. He is here said ex-
 pressly, to be “umquhill” or deceased then†. He
 was hanged by the rebels themselves, on the
 3d of January preceding‡. *Then* the rebels
 could speak out, of his coming for the letters, of
 his receiving them, and of his being intercepted
 with them. But they could not *before*. They
 had two very particular calls to speak out, the
 very month immediately preceding his death.
 They then dwelt with a most extraordinary
 energy, upon the letters. Yet they were com-
 pletely silent concerning the mode, by which
 these important documents were derived to their
 hands. They said not a word to Dalgleishe.
 They uttered not a syllable of his or any one’s
 coming to the castle for them, receiving them
 there, and being taken with them on his return.
 Upon this point, absolutely necessary as it was to au-
 thenticate them, they are studiously and affectedly
 silent§. However necessary in itself, it was not
 to be spoken then. THE MAN WAS STILL

* Appendix, No. iv.

† See Anderson, i. 173, for *umquhill*. It means in strict-
 ness *one-while* or *formerly*, and so comes to signify *deceased*.

‡ Detection, 159.

§ Appendix, No. i. and xi.

ALIVE. But, after his death, they could be as talkative and as circumstantial, as we here see them to be. And these two incidents in their publick conduct, thus fairly opposed to each other, and shown the more livelily by the contrast; form an evidence of forgery in the asserted fact of the discovery, that must strike upon every mind.

But we have some interesting intimations preparatory to the discovery, which made their appearance in October 1569, TEN months after the journal, TWELVE after the earliest account above, and more than FOUR AND TWENTY before the fullest. They are furnished by what is called, the second confession of Paris. And they were inserted in it, in order to show us how Mary's letters to Bothwell, and not Bothwell's to Mary, came to be lodged in a box of Mary's. Yet, in a forgery, there will always be a choice of difficulties. On whichever side of the truth, the man of villainy diverts into falsehoods; some absurdity will adhere to him, will hang upon his steps, and embarrass his movements. This confession takes particular care, to point out the derivation of the box from Mary to Bothwell. But, by an astonishing infatuation, it makes the box into two. And it thus destroys the whole story of the discovery, almost as effectually, as if it had disproved the whole in point of fact.

“Elle ne luy dit chose de consequence,” says this deponent concerning the Queen and himself *just after the murder*, “jusques a ce qu' elle alloit
“a Seton,” which by the rebel journal was on Fe-

bruary 21st, 1567 *. “Alors elle lui comman-
 “daft de prendre UNE CASSETTE, ou il y avoit
 “..... *que le thesaurier lui apporté de France;*
 “pour la porter a la chambre de Monsieur de
 “Boduel, qui estoit a ceste heur-lá logé dedans
 “le palais †” From the French derivation of
 this strong box, and from the conveyance of it
 out of France by the Queen’s comptroller, it is
 apparently the very box, which was afterwards
 made the repository of the letters.

But, as I have hinted already, we have another
 box of Mary’s in this confession. It is entirely
 different from the former. Yet it is equally
 Mary’s, and equally sent by her to Bothwell. We
 have the account of it, immediately after the ac-
 count of the other. The Queen, it is said, “qu’
 “elle alloit a Seton,” told Paris to carry “une
 “cassette” to Bothwell’s chamber in the palace;
 and just afterwards, “puis apres, lui commande
 “de prendre SON COFFRE DES BAGUES, et les
 “faire porter AU CHASTEAU, et le delivrer entre
 “les mains de Sieur de Skirling, pour lors Capi-
 “taine soubz Monsieur de Bodwel ‡.” Here the
 mention of the coffer, as the box in which the
 Queen kept her rings, and consequently all her
 jewels §; the order for conveying it to the castle;

* Appendix, No. x.

† Goodall, ii. 82.

‡ Goodall, ii. 82.

§ So Mary calls the *ring* sent her by Elizabeth, “*la bague*
 “*que m’aves envoyée,*” the most precious *jewel* that she had,
 “*comme mon plus cher joyau*” (Haynes, 464). So like-
 wise says one Sherington in England; “his *jewells*—remayn-
 “*eth in his compting-howse within a boxe, they be all rings*”
 (Haynes, 64).

and the command to deliver it into the hands of Bothwell's deputy there; all fix it to be the very casket for the letters.

Thus are we distracted betwixt the two Dromios and the two Antipholuses; sometimes believing the one to be genuine, and sometimes denying the other to be spurious; till we are involved in a Comedy of Errours about them. But in the present case we come to see plainly at last, that, however such a mistake might very easily arise, when there were two Dromios and two Antipholuses; yet it could not possibly have happened, when there was only one of each. In nature it could not. It could only in that poor representation of nature, which the counterfeiters of her operations frequently make, and in which they "imitate humanity so abominably;" that every judicious observer cries out at the view, Thou art "a piece of art." And art was here imposed upon by its passions. With an eager officiousness of spirit, coming forward to the support of forgery; it adds falsehood to falsehood with such a ready tongue, that it entangles itself in the snares of its own tale, and destroys the cause which it was meaning to defend. Resolved to obviate the very natural objection, of Mary's letters to Bothwell being found in a box of Mary's, and not in a box of Bothwell's; it instantly creates an order from Mary, for the transmission of one of her boxes to Bothwell. Nor is it content with this. It will do more. The work of creation is easy to it. This therefore leads it on. The keen desire of securing the point, beyond all possibility

of objection hereafter; stimulates it strongly. From the united impulses of both, it provides two boxes for the emergency. And thus it so far “out-steps the modesty of nature,” as to enter upon the confines of madness itself; and, like the mad hero in Statius, has two Thebes and two suns appearing before it.

This however is the whole of the notices, which the rebels have thought proper to give us latterly and in form, concerning the pretended discovery of the letters. We have already found some of the more detached parts, burdened with their own falsehood, and weighed down with their own contradictoriness. But let us now proceed to examine the more important. And we shall behold the contradictoriness and the falsehood, pressing with a still heavier weight upon the whole.

Bothwell, say the rebels, before his flight to the north about June the 20th, and even, as they must mean, before his departure from Edinburgh on June the 7th*; left in the castle of Edinburgh a strong box, which had once been presented by Francis, King of France, to Mary his Queen, which had been since sent by Mary to Bothwell, and in which Bothwell had repositied Mary's letters to him. But WHY did Mary send this box to Bothwell? On this point the confession, the journal, and the Detection are equally silent. Their respective authours could not invent any reason, that would appear satisfactory even to their own imaginations. They had al-

* Appendix, No. x.

ready shown the box in England, with the signatures of Francis upon it. They were therefore compelled to adhere to the box for ever afterwards ; in spite of the absurdity, which attended the selection of such a repository. They had overlooked the absurdity themselves. It was first suggested to them, no doubt, at the first production of the repository in Westminster. And this made them attempt to preclude the objection with such unfortunate zeal, in the second confession of Paris. It was *afterwards* observed probably, that this confession had defeated itself in its zeal. It had created a couple of boxes. It had thus accumulated absurdity upon absurdity. The rebels, for that reason, shrunk back again from their story, of Mary's donation of the box to Bothwell. They left the reader to guess at the manner, in which the box came into Bothwell's possession. And so they delivered us the account, which Buchanan has presented to us in his *English* Detection. But still what could be the reason, for Mary's making such a donation to Bothwell ? There could only be one. It is this.

When Francis first gave it to Mary, he gave it with its proper accompaniment of jewels within. When Mary remitted it afterwards to Bothwell, she must equally have remitted it with its contents of jewels to him. An empty casket, would be a mere mockery of a donation in itself. It would be peculiarly a mockery, from a King or a Queen. It would be a high indignity put upon his love, and a gross insult offered to her Majesty. The rebels therefore must mean to intimate, that the jewels were sent with the casket to

Bothwell. And they actually intimate as much, in the very terms of the confession; Mary ordering Paris to take her box of jewels, “*son coffre des bagues, et les faire porter au chasteau.*” The Queen is thus made to strip herself of her jewels, in a mad love-fit of generosity. She strips herself of them too, at the very time when (according to the letters) she wanted them most; when she was deeply in love with Bothwell; when Bothwell treated her with a great indifference; and when she needed every attraction of personal ornament, to set off her fine person, and to fire his cold heart. She strips herself of them likewise, though she was a woman peculiarly studious of personal decoration, upon every occasion; in order to confer them upon a man, who, as such, could not wear them. And, at the conclusion of the whole, we are historically informed by the rebels themselves, that she had *not* given away her jewels; that they *saw* she had not, when they entered Edinborough, and took possession of her palace; and that they then found her jewels, repositied there. They took an inventory, says that compiler from rebel authorities, Calderwood, in his MS. history of the times; of “all the plate, JEWELS, and other moveables” in the palace*. “This was done,” says Blackwood, “the night before the Queen’s commitment to Lochlevin,” and consequently on the 15th of June †. This was done “shortly after the Queen’s commitment,” says Calderwood with more probability; and consequently about the very day,

* Keith, 407.

† Jebb, ii. 219.

that they pretended to intercept the casket, with letters instead of jewels within it, as it was coming from the castle. They *now*, no doubt, got possession of it for the first time. They discharged it of its jewels. These they applied to their own uses by sale, as they did the Queen's side-board of plate by fusion*. They employed Nicholas laird of Elphinston in the office of selling them, who was one of Rizzio's murderers, was pardoned at the solicitation of Murray, and continued an active implement of his to the last †. Murray gave several of them to his own wife; then sent Elphinston with the others, up to London; made presents of some to Elizabeth and to her ministry, both having the infinite meanness to accept them; and sold the rest in Flanders and in France ‡. And a long while afterwards, in

* Keith, 407, and Preface, ix; and Crawford, 44. Mary brought into Scotland with her, "*manie riche and costlie jewels of gold worke, pretious stones, great pearls, and such like, as excellent and faire as were to be found within Europe*; with rich furniture of household, as hangings, carpets, counterpoints, and all other necessaries for the furnishing of hir princelie houses" (Hollinshed, iii. 377).

† Anderson, iv. pt. i. 63, 111. Lesley's Negotiations, 83, Goodall, i. 304—305, Keith, App. 169, Hist. 300, 423, &c. and Melvill, 93.

‡ Haynes, 621, and Jebb, ii. 219. Elizabeth wrote to Murray, on October the 2d, 1568, *just when he was now come out of Scotland*, and now, with Nicholas Elphinston and others in his company (Melvill, 93), *approaching York* (Goodall, ii. 112 and 108); "to forbear to put to sale any of the Queen of Scotts *juells* or goods" (Murdin, 765). He therefore had not *then* presented Elizabeth, with any of the jewels. He took the hint, however, from this letter. It was meant

in a most unlucky moment, and when all their stars shone very inauspiciously upon them; they appropriated the casket, to the receipt of their forged letters.

Mary however is said by the rebels, to have sent one casket *up to the castle*. This therefore was certainly stored with jewels. The jewels were too valuable, to be left exposed to the coming danger. And for that reason they were deposited in the hands of a man, who was lieutenant-governour of the castle under Bothwell. This was done, we are told, some little time after the murder, when the Queen went away to Seton, about the 21st of February, 1567. But *then* there was no danger coming. *Then* there was even no alarm of danger. She therefore could not send her jewels to the castle, *then*. And when the danger actually came, in the beginning of June; she did *not* send her jewels to the castle. She left them at Holyrood-house, even when she was obliged to abandon it herself.

So absurd and false appears the story of the casket, in any light, in which it can be held up to the eye of the understanding! Yet, in this casket, the rebels say that Bothwell repositied his letters from Mary. Bothwell, we are to suppose, took out the jewels, sold them privately, and as a hint by Elizabeth herself. She who could receive, would naturally invite, the jewels. Cecil himself, no doubt, was one of the ministry, that came in for a share of them. And thus Elizabeth and her ministers appear, receiving a bribe from Murray, and sharing with him in the spoils of Mary; at the very time, they were pretending to try the cause between them.

supplied

supplied their place with the letters. These letters he must have received, at his own apartments in Holyrood-house; even at those very apartments, to which Mary sent the first box of the confession, the box that her comptroller had brought her out of France. In those lodgings therefore, this box and the letters now met for the first time. The letters from Glasgow, as I shall show hereafter, must have been there before the box. And the letters from Stirling, must have come thither to it successively afterwards. So far the train is in regular order. There is no embarrassment yet, in the line of the procession. But one arises immediately. This is a great one. The letters and the box are united together, at Holyrood-house! But how come they together into the castle? Of this we have no account at all. And the most material link in the chain of conveyance, has here been forgotten to be formed by the rebels. Let us therefore turn to the *second* box of the confession, and see if the transmission is more carefully noticed there. This box, indeed, is transmitted to the castle at once. We thus overleap the grand chasm in the narrative of the other, at the very outset. We have the box deposited safely in the castle. But *are the letters in it?* No! The Glasgow letters are still at Holyrood-house. And the Stirling letters *are not yet written*. So much more defective is even this account, than that! Both together indeed, with some alterations, would make one fair and regular narrative. They would unite
to

to tell us, that Mary sent her casket of jewels by Paris to Bothwell, about February the 21st; that *Bothwell sent this casket* by Paris to the castle, *about June the 7th*; and that *he, Paris, remarked it felt much lighter at the second conveyance, than at the first*. This would be false in fact; but it would be regular in the narration of incidents, and conformable to the history of the times. This indeed should so naturally have been the very line, in which the train of the story ought to have moved; that I cannot but express my wonder, it was not the actual one. I can only attribute the deviation, to those overpowering fears and suspicions, which must ever attend a fabrication of villainy like this, and which stifle and smother the natural exertions of understanding, in the work. In this state of guilty distraction, the mind formed an account, which bears all the symptoms of her own distraction upon it. It has divided the only narration into two. It has thrown in some circumstances to the one. It has presented some circumstances to the other. It has superadded some to both, that are still more embarrassing; while it has never subjoined some to either, that are absolutely necessary to the consistency of the whole. And it has thus framed two accounts, which, if taken separately, are contradictory to each other; which, if united together, must be united by the sacrifice of parts in each; which, whether taken separately or in union, require equally an addition of parts to each; which, even at last, would be still absurd in their manner, and false in their matter; and therefore

therefore betray that imposture in the clearest manner, which they were originally contrived to cover.

But let us lend a friendly hand to the limping genius of forgery, and then observe how it will be able to walk. Let us suppose the casket to have been sent to Bothwell, in the end of February, 1567; to have been kept by him, till the beginning of June; and at that time to have been transmitted by him, with its freight of letters, to the castle. He must then have lodged them in the castle, to keep them in safety from the seizure of his enemies. And he must have locked them up in the casket, to preserve them in security from the curiosity of his friends. But why, in the name of common sense, should he lock them up in *THIS* box above any other? It was certainly the most improper repository for them, that could have been selected in the whole compass of nature. It was silver gilt, and “garnischt in *sindrie* places with the Roman letter F. under ane Kingis crowne.” It told therefore to every eye, whose property the box had originally been, and from whose hands it came immediately into Bothwell’s. It consequently proclaimed the adultery aloud. And it even insinuated the murder, in more than a whisper to the world. It therefore told all, that the letters could have told themselves. They do only insinuate the murder. They can only proclaim the adultery. They might as well therefore have lain open to inspection, as have been locked up in such a tell-tale and betraying coffer. Bothwell
must

must have seen this. Every body must have seen it. And yet, such is the swelling absurdity of all this rebel history, he locked them up in the tell-tale and betraying coffer; when he had actually “a green velvet desk” in the castle itself, and actually lodged some important papers within it*.

Important papers he might well lodge there. But why should he attempt to lodge the letters? They could not be of the slightest use to him, *if* he preserved them. They would be of infinite detriment, both to himself and to the Queen; *if* their enemies should get possession of them. In this state of circumstances, why should he attempt to preserve them at all? If he wished, as he must certainly wish, and very earnestly too, to secure them from the grasp of his and her enemies; the natural and obvious mode of acting, was to destroy them. This would be a compendious means of saving them. This would be an effectual stroke, for the prevention of all mischief from them. And he could certainly have thought of no other method of disposing of them, than by throwing them into the fire at once.

But perhaps, as I am equally willing with the most resolute advocates for the rebels, to make any supposition, which may soften the absurdities, and reconcile the contradictions, of their accounts; Bothwell may be supposed to be so deeply in love with Mary at the time, that he loved her letters for her sake, that he was therefore unwill-

* Robertson, ii. 463.

ling to burn those precious tokens of her love to him, and that he finally resolved to preserve them at any rate,

Against his better knowledge, not deceived,
But fondly overcome with female charm.

We thus venture to the very verge of phrenzy, in order to vindicate the radical absurdity of the rebel narrative. Yet we cannot do it. Even the phrenzy of love itself, would not excuse him. When such strong and powerful reasons concurred to urge him on, to the immediate destruction of the letters; when only such slight and petty reasons withheld his hand from the deed; even a love-phrenzy itself would have consigned them to the flames. The sense of danger, and the dread of destruction, to Mary as well as to himself, would have acted with an irresistible force upon his spirit; have swept the reveries of fantastical love, in a whirlwind before them; and lodged the letters at once in the fire. And, after all, the supposition itself is founded on a falsehood. Even according to the letters themselves, Bothwell was *not* mad in love, whatever Mary may be there. He is indeed described, as just the contrary. *He is not in love at all. Her affection flames out. But his never burns.* She steps very boldly forward, to catch him in her arms. He steps as modestly backward, and declines the intended embrace. She appears all glowing with love, while he is wholly iced over with indifference. And such a man as this, would

would be so far from determining to preserve the letters, at the risque of his fortune and his life; that he would not have kept them with any risque at all, would have taken particular care *not* to keep them, and have chosen with a cautious and steady sollicitude, to have burned every letter successively at the very moment.

Yet, in this necessary state of sollicitude for the successive destruction of the letters, Bothwell is made to preserve them, to preserve them carefully, and to preserve them at the hazard of all that was dear to him. And the rebels are determined, to put the credulity of their friends to the severest test.

In this test then, let us even suppose with the ever-flanderous Buchanan *, That Bothwell kept the letters as a guard against the mutability of Mary's mind, and as an evidence of her participation with him in the murder. We thus shift from love to policy. But we equally reverse the characters of both the agents. We give to her, a mutability that never existed. The firm and steady spirit of Mary, which showed itself so signally in all the great occasions of her eventful life; and which bore her up with such a magnanimity of heroism, under all her unparalleled sufferings; is made to dissolve away, in the weakness of a wanton giddiness. And the sun is exhibited, with all the changing phases of the moon. Bothwell also is represented, as equally the very opposite of what he was. He, who scarcely

* Hist. xviii. 364. So also Mr. Hume, v. 145.

looked forward to the very next moment that was advancing upon him, is supposed to be darting a keen and piercing glance into futurity, “bending “his eyes” firmly on mere “vacancy” itself, and catching eagerly at the void of air before him. And, what is more, he is supposed to be acting under this prophetick view of hereafter, with all that lively energy of unmeaning terrour, which constitutes the very essence of madness. In the violence of his impressions from an apprehended, a contingent, and an imaginary danger; he is made to overlook a real one, to encounter a formidable one, and even to force down one, that came charged with certain destruction to him. He is made to keep the letters, for fear Mary should lay her share of the murder upon his head; and so to preserve them for those assassins, who would be sure to lay the whole upon the heads of both; to preserve them, when he saw them coming to assassinate both, and felt them striking boldly at both with their poniards; and to preserve them, as so many *stilettos* poisoned ready to their hands, sure to be instantly turned against both, and capable of inflicting wounds infinitely more malignant in their nature, than any from their own weapons. This is the very consummation of insanity. And the poor Bedlamite, that fancied himself formed of glass, and was therefore afraid of almost every touch; could only have been a proper companion for the Bothwell of Buchanan: if, in the strong pressure of this fear upon his mind, he had refused to perform all the ordinary functions of life; and
so

so had killed himself by his wildness, lest he should be hurt in his brittleness.

But, even allowing either the insanity of policy, or the phrenzy of love, in Bothwell, to have determined on preserving the letters; why should Bothwell send them for their preservation, *to the castle?* He did it, as we are told, “before his fleeing away” from Edinburgh, in June, 1567. A rebellion was then rising in the nation, which gave a very great alarm to the Queen and him, on the 1st of June*. He was forced to flee before it with her, upon the 7th†. Yet he and she could make their escape that day, to Borthwick castle. Why then should they not have carried their letters with them, if they would preserve them? They must have carried articles of much greater bulk, and of infinitely less consequence. And the very anxiety, that would have lodged the letters in the castle of Edinburgh, would much rather have taken care to secure them, under their own protection. But indeed there seems to have been so little time given them, at the moments of their flight; that they could take no care for the letters, or for any thing else. They appear to have actually fled away from Edinburgh, with so much precipitation; that they left even the Queen’s private jewels, behind them. They might therefore have possibly *forgotten* in the hurry, to take the letters with them; though these were a thou-

* Keith, 396—398.

† Ibid, 398; Lesley’s Defence, 17; and Appendix, No. x.

land times more important to them, than the jewels. But they could certainly have had no time then, to form a plan for preserving the letters, and to send them up to the castle for safety. And, even if they could, the castle of Edinburgh was the last place in the world, to which they would have ordered the letters at the time. So mountainous and overgrown does the absurdity of the rebel narrative appear, as we proceed! The very man to whom the Queen and Bothwell had entrusted the command of the castle, was actually turning a traitor to them. He had actually banded with their rebels, against them. It was even he, that forced Bothwell and the Queen to relinquish Edinburgh so precipitately, on the 7th of June *. And to send the letters up to the castle therefore, for fear lest they should fall into the hands of their enemies; would be to act the part of the charmed bird in America, and, out of pure terrour from the rattle-snake, to run directly into its mouth. Borthwick castle, to which the Queen and he fled from Edinburgh; and Dunbar castle, to which they progressively retired from Borthwick; must necessarily have been the place of security, to which even madness would have conveyed the letters: even if it had been wound up to such a pitch of extravagance, as to resolve upon preserving them at all. Nor could the highest pitch of possible madness, that would keep a man from confinement in a

* Lesley's Defence, 17, and Melvill, 81—82.

dark cell and straw, have ever thought of choos-
ing Edinburgh castle, for its place of security
then.

But who was the wretch, that had then the
command of the castle? Bothwell was the real
commandant, and had a deputy under him. This
deputy, says the confession, was “*Sieur de*
“*Skirling, pour lors Capitaine soubz Monsieur de*
“*Bodwell.*” It says so indeed, at the time the
Queen sent her box of jewels, “*son coffre des*
“*bagues,*” up to the castle. This it fixes to the
period, of the Queen’s going from Holyrood-
house to Seton; February the 21st. But *then*,
and for nearly four weeks afterwards, Bothwell
was *not* commandant of the castle himself, and
could therefore have no deputy. He was not
made governour till March the 19th following*.
And we thus disprove the asserted fact, by a po-
sitive appeal to chronology. Indeed the very
fact itself, as I have hinted before, implies it to
have happened at a later period than either.
The Queen must have committed her jewels to
the charge of the deputy-governour, upon some
apprehensions for their safety. She could have
no such apprehensions, before the marriage. Till
this had taken place, even regicide did not rouse
the rebels; Bothwell appeared supported by all
their nobles; and though they might have crush-
ed Bothwell, they could not have crushed the
Queen with him. Till this had taken place

* Keith, 379, Robertson, i. 404, and Anderson, i. Pref.
lxiv.

therefore,

therefore, neither she nor he entertained any apprehensions of danger. And then the “Sieur “de Skirling,” was not captain of the castle under him. By this French appellation, is meant Sir James Cockburn of Skirling, Knight; who was afterwards a commissioner for Mary at the conferences in England *, and had previously been comptroller to her †. But he does not appear, to have ever been captain of the castle. He appears *not* to have been, at the only period in which Mary could have apprehensions, for either her jewels or her letters; at the period of rising danger, immediately after the marriage. She was married on the 15th of May ‡. But, previously and subsequently to the 15th, Sir James Balfour, not Sir James Cockburn, was captain of the castle under Bothwell. He had been appointed, no doubt, upon the 19th of March before, and on Bothwell’s receipt of the supreme command from the Queen. “For the “Earl and he,” says Melvill, “had been great “companions, and he was also very great with “the Queen §; so that the custody of the “castle of Edinburgh was committed to him ||.” Bothwell, says Spotswood still more explicitly, “got the castle of Edinburgh in his custody, “upon the Earl of Marre his resignation; placing “therein Sir James Balfour, whom he especially “trusted ¶.” He appears accordingly in pos-

* Goodall, ii. 109. † Keith, 410. ‡ Appendix, No. x.

§ See also Paris’s second confession in Goodall, ii. 83.

|| P. 81.

¶ P. 201, edit. 3d.

fession of it, at the beginning of May. Crawford's MS. tells us concerning Bothwell, that he brought the Queen from Dunbar castle to Edinburgh, which appears to have been upon the *third* of May; and "conveyed her Majestie—" "into the castle, where a subject of his was, "called Sir James Balfour*. And Sir James Balfour is the person, who is said before to have delivered up the letters to the servant, whom Bothwell had sent to him for them. If therefore we fix the fact of Mary's sending her casket into the castle, and depositing it in the hands of the lieutenant-governour, to the time mentioned in the only narrative of the fact, the end of February; the "Sieur de Skirling" was certainly not then lieutenant-governour under Bothwell, because Bothwell was not governour himself then. Or if we push forward with the fact to the only period in which it could have happened, the alarms and apprehensions at the beginning of June; though Bothwell was then governour, the "Sieur de Skirling" was not governour under him. And, at either period, the mention of his name adds one more to the many notes of forgery, which we have in this pretended discovery of the letters.

But we have others. One particularly appears, in the *keeping* and *disposition* of the main object here. The rebels forced the un-defended gates of Edinburgh, upon the 10th and 12th of

* Keith, 384.

June*. They marched out of Edinburgh again, upon the 15th. They met the Queen and Bothwell in the field, that day. She came over to them. Deserted by his Queen and his wife, he hasted back to Dunbar, from which he had come with her. And the royal army dispersed. Yet, even then, Bothwell is represented as making an effort to recover his letters.

He had previously lodged them in the castle of Edinburgh, when he could not have had one particle of affiance upon his deputy there. But this wildness is exceeded by his extravagance now. He now attempts to draw them out of the castle again, when he must have known his deputy to be a most perfidious traitour. He had made no attempt, before he had been forced out of Edinburgh by this very deputy. He must have suspected him, before he fled from him. Yet he tried no experiment then, for recovering the letters. He returned with an army towards Edinburgh, in order to fight the rebels. The balance of empire might then seem to hang suspended, between the rebels and him. Then, therefore, a wretch of such commodious principles as Balfour appears to have been, *might* be inclined to do his old friend and patron a beneficial service in secret; so to efface his own perfidy and villainy before; and to create himself an interest with him again, in case he should

* Keith, 399, records of the town-council. They forced the suburb gates on the 10th, drew up a proclamation there on the 11th, and forced the city-gates on the 12th.

be successful. In those critical moments, he *might* be induced clandestinely to return him the letters, which he knew to be fraught with such ruin to him. Yet, in those moments, Bothwell neglected to make any application for them.

On the 15th of June, all his towering imaginations were dashed to the ground at once. He had come to Carberrie hill, followed by an army, and accompanied by a Queen. He now fled, attended only by a single servant*. He was glad

* A kind of cenotaph was formed for Darnly in a painting of the time, now preserved in Kensington Palace, and engraved by Vertue in 1742. This was compared by Vertue with another painting of the time, found by the Duke of Richmond in his castle of Aubigny, France, and brought by him over into England. The imperfections of each, made by time or design, have been supplied from the other. And both appear to have been formed by a Venetian painter in London, for Darnly's father the Earl of Lenox, in January 1567-8. But in an inscription, preserved only by the Duke of Richmond's picture, is a chronological blunder, which has never been noticed, and yet is very gross. Darnly is said to have been slain on the *nineteenth* of February, "interfectus xix. die mensis Februarii;" when he was certainly slain in the night between the ninth and tenth, and about two o'clock in the morning of the tenth. In a corner of this, as in a picture hung up within a chapel, is a delineation of the battle at Carberry-hill; which has been since engraved by Vertue, in a separate piece, and on a large scale. In it is seen Bothwell, going off from the field with only one servant. And he appears in two breaks of the hills behind, accompanied by his single attendant still, and taking a circuitous route to Dunbar. The two originals of this painting were kept, one in possession of the Earl of Lenox, the other in that of his brother John, Lord of Aubigny; from whom the latter descended to the present Duke of Richmond, and the former

glad to shelter himself in the castle of Dunbar, from the vengeance due to his crimes. And even there he found himself obliged in a very few days, according to the rebel accounts, to “flee be sea to the north.” Yet at this very time he makes an effort from Dunbar, which he had never made while he was in Edinburgh itself. In this very extremity of distress he tries a bold experiment, which he had not courage to try, when he was fortified with the authority of the Queen, and when he was facing the rebels openly in the field. And in the very hour, when almost every friend has at last deserted him, he expects a return of friendship from a man, who had deserted him at first, only because he *suspected* him to be in danger. He is thus described by the paradoxical extravagance of forgery, as successively neglecting every moment of probability for the work, and as finally choosing a moment of impossibility for it; when it was absolutely impossible to do it, and absolutely impossible to hope he should do it. And the forgery stands forward again, upon the face of the asserted fact*.

At this period, however, Bothwell is represented as sending his servant George Dalgleshe from Dunbar, to make his way through the coun-

former to that Earl of Pomfret, who presented it to Queen Caroline in 1738.

* But Mr. Hume has made it stand out still more forward, by asserting the castle to have been then “besieged” by the rebels (v. 145). He inflames the absurdity, by an incident as ridiculous as it is untrue.

try to Edinborough, and through the city to the castle; to wait upon Balfour, the acting governor, with a requisition for the box of letters; and to bring back the important charge, through ten thousand dangers, to Dunbar. He did not order him, as common sense required he should have done in such circumstances, when he had once got the letters into his own possession, not to risque the very probable seizure of them by the hands of hostility, but to destroy them instantly and effectually. No! He sent to fetch them from the castle, as if there was no danger in going thither, no doubt of receiving them there, and no difficulty in carrying them back. To a traveller in an easy chair, all roads are smooth, and all days are fine. And the writer of an eastern tale, can make rocks open at the sound of a charm, and palaces rise by virtue of a magick lamp. Dalgleshe thus makes good his course through the country, though he was a well-known servant of Bothwell's. He makes good his entrance at the gates of the city, though this was guarded by 450 harquebusiers*. He makes good his passage from the city into the castle. And he delivers his message. If this was *written*, it must then have been an implement of equal danger to Bothwell and to him, in case he had been searched on the way. If it was unwritten, then it must have been ascertained to the governor of the castle by some well-known token, which would perhaps have been equally dangerous. But, what is more astonish-

* Robertson, ii. 372.

ing than all, he actually receives the box of letters from Sir James Balfour. This indeed is “o’er-doing Termagant; it out-herods Herod.” Balfour was the ductile slave of selfishness. He had already turned with infinite perfidiousness against his friend, his patron, and his Queen; merely because he found a party rising in the state, which he thought would be too strong for them. He had particularly united to assault Bothwell, in the height of his power and greatness; because he saw him tottering to his fall. He now knew him to be fallen. He beheld him, as it were, struck to the ground by a thunder-bolt. Bothwell was now an almost solitary refugee at Dunbar, condemned as a regicide by the ruling powers, and execrated as a regicide by all the nation. The Queen herself was in a still lower situation of distress. She was treated with a thousand indignities, by those who had invited her to come over to them. She was carried away by violence in the night, and imprisoned in one of her own castles; by those who had promised to show her every respect, and had engaged to pay her every obedience. Such was the infamous presumption of triumphant rebellion, at this moment! The whole kingdom, indeed, bowed beneath the power of these profligates. And yet this is the very season selected by the infatuation of forgery, for selfishness to become generous in its spirit, for meanness to become exalted in its sentiments, and for a Balfour to do an heroical act of kindness. “He
 “had,” says a cotemporary writer, “before as-
 “fisted

“sifted the faction against the Quene, with the
 “force and strength of Edenborough castle; and
 “driven from thence the very Earle himself*.”
 The faction, says the same writer in another
 place, afterwards “got into the town and for-
 “tresse of Edenborough; by the treason of Bal-
 “foure the captaine thereof, and of Cragmiller
 “the provost of the citie †.” In these circum-
 stances, asks the very same writer, “is it to be
 “thought, that either the Earle would send to the
 “said Sir James, or that the said Sir James
 “would send any thing to the Earle? Is it like-
 “ly? Is it credible ‡?” These acts indeed
 were too important in their nature, too enormous
 in their villainy, and too recent in their dates;
 to be forgiven at present by Bothwell, or to ad-
 mit any hope of forgiveness in Balfour. They
 must therefore have operated upon the latter,
 with the usual influence of committed enormities,
 upon the minds and spirits of the committers.
 They must have made him wish, to heap new
 enormities upon the heads of the old, to crush
 Bothwell completely under all, and so to preclude
 all possibility of punishment from him hereafter.
 And, for this reason, the grand historian and ad-
 vocate for rebellion, when he came to model his
 account of this transaction in the calmer hour of
 revival, and to free it from the objections lying
 too strongly against it; did then for the *first*
 time represent Balfour, as acting in this very
 manner, as giving up the letters to Dalgleshe,

* Lesley's Defence, 16—17. † Ibid. 35. ‡ P. 16—17.

and *then sending notice to Morton for his interception* *."

Thus acting, Balfour is regularly and uniformly a knave. But then his knavery is equalled by his folly. When he dismissed the letters, in expectation of recovering them again by Morton; he knew not but Dalgleishe might have orders, to baffle his expectation and to secure the letters. Dalgleishe might elude the guards set for him. Dalgleishe might destroy the papers, before he was taken by them. He might secrete the papers for the present, and come privately for them afterwards. Or, he might throw the box of letters at once, down the precipices of the castle, and have it conveyed away immediately, by some associates at the bottom. Any one of these practices, would have barred the recovery of the letters for ever. And the man, who had suffered the bird to fly out of his hand, because he was confident he could catch it again; would have been considered by Morton and his rebel brethren, as a fool and an idiot for the act. None but a fool, none but an idiot, they would have justly cried, could ever have given up the letters at all to Dalgleishe. He had no reserves of delicacy, to keep with Bothwell. These he had long laid aside, even when he drove him from the city. These he had doubly laid aside, when he combined with the provost to put the rebels in possession of the town and castle. Or, even if he had not, was the great cause itself to be

* Buchanan, Hist. xviii. 364.

sacrificed to his personal views of policy? Morton himself must also have shared with him, in the censure of folly. He had agreed with Balfour, for the dismissal and the interception. He had known of the former being designed, that he might prepare himself and his guards, for the execution of the latter. He had not diverted the design. He had actually made himself a party in it. He would therefore have been considered by the rebels, as equally an idiot and a fool with Balfour. Indeed almost all the actors in this whole drama, and particularly in this first part of it, are to be considered as fools and idiots in fact; or else the wretched plot cannot be carried on. And, when we sit down to read the Arabian Nights Entertainments, we must first allow ourselves to be cheated into the belief of genii, talismans, and flying horses of wood; and then we are borne smoothly, down the stream of the story to the end.

But we have not the slightest authority for supposing, that Morton and Balfour did act with this idiot folly. Let us therefore vindicate them from the charge. In their lifetime, whatever they may think now, they would rather have been considered as knaves than fools. All knaves think the same. Nor were they either fools or idiots in reality. Nor do the preceding accounts of the rebels, even *hint* that they were. “June
“20,” says the journal, “Dalgleshe wes takin,
“and the box and letteris *qubilk* he brought out
“of the castell.” “This box,” says Buchanan,
“in the castell of Edinburgh—was left be the
“Erle

“ Erle Bothwell,—and was send for be ane
 “ George Daglishe his fervand, *quha was takin*
 “ *be ye Erle of Mortoun.*” These do not hint
 in the slightest degree, at any agreement betwixt
 Morton and Balfour, to let the letters go out of
 the castle, and to stop them at a little way from
 it. They only say, that Dalgleshe came out of
 the castle with the letters, and consequently had
 received them from the hands of Balfour; and
 that Morton seized him and them, after they
 were come out. But another account, which is
 equally derived from the rebels themselves, goes
 on farther; and, by its *manner*, entirely precludes
 all this wild story, of an agreement betwixt Mor-
 ton and Balfour. The box, says the Bishop of
 Ross from them, was “ takin from one Dough-
 “ leyshe, the Earles man forsooth; which letters
 “ he *received* at Edenborough of one Sir James
 “ *Balfoure*, TO CONVEY TO HIS MASTER*.”
 The whole story, therefore, is equally unfounded
 and false. It is merely the surmise of posterour
 refinement. To the just eye of criticism, the ori-
 ginal accounts appeared fraught with absurdity,
 in Balfour’s surrendering up the letters to Dal-
 gleishe, for him “ to convey” them “ to his ma-
 “ ster.” All consistency of character was grossly
 violated. Every principle of common sense was
 given up, to the clamours of forgery. An at-
 tempt was therefore made, by a supposition of
 what is not said, and by an interpolation of what
 is actually precluded, to reconcile all the jarring

* Lesley’s Defence, 6, Anderson, 1.

parts of the story to each other ; and to lend that historical smoothness to the whole, of which it is dreadfully devoid at present. And the airy surmise serves like the slight wall, which an Irish engineer is said to have raised, before the powder-magazine of an Irish castle ; not to be any guard to the magazine from its slightness, yet to indicate the place of peculiar danger to the enemy, to attract his shot to the point, and to blow up the whole by the blundering artifice *.

These remarks are sufficient to show the wonderful infatuation, that has taken place in the fabrication of this primary part of the forgery. But I shall add one remark more. It is principally a chronological one. And anachronisms are the strongest, of all possible proofs of forgery. The grand reason insinuated by the rebels, for Bothwell's conduct in sending for the letters about June the 20th ; is this. He was just going to set out for the north, and wanted to secure the papers before he went. " June 20th," says the journal, " Dalgleshe—wes takin, &c. : about " this tyme, my Lord Buthwell fled be sea to

* Queen Mary is said in Douglas's Peerage, 106, to have given Sir James Balfour, " before she went to Lochleven castle, as an instance of her esteem and regard for Sir James, " —a small gold bell with her name on it, and an enamelled " cup and cover said to have been King Malcolm Canmore's ; " both which are now in the possession of Mrs. Balfour, " the heir of line of this Sir James." Most probably, both were only his share of the plunder of her palace, obtained just after she was sent away to Lochleven. Mary would certainly not give him any thing then.

“the north.” But the reason is equally impertinent and false.

Had he never thought of going to the north, had he actually gone to the south, and even gone to neither, but staid where he was at Dunbar; still he must have equally wished to recover his letters, and still his letters must have been equally in danger from the rebels. But indeed his letters, if lodged in the castle before he left Edinburgh on June the 7th, must on June the 20th have been beyond all chance of danger, and beyond all wishes for recovery. They must have been already in the possession of the rebels. Nor could the design of departing to the north, have possibly suggested any effort, that would either hasten the possession or remove the danger. And the rebels must have been masters of them, the moment they entered Edinburgh on the 12th of June before. Then Balfour had done his worst. He had thrown the die for rebellion. He had past the Rubicon of villainy. He and his brother rebels could now stand only, by their firmness, their effrontery, and their audaciousness. And as to break open a box, that carried such plain evidence of its guilty contents within, would naturally be the first, because it would be a private, act of perfidy to Bothwell and the Queen; so to produce these letters to the other chiefs of the rebels, to show them to all, and to publish them to the world, would be a necessary act of wisdom and justice, for the vindication of him and them, and for the joint condemnation of the Queen and Bothwell.

Nor

Nor is the departure of Bothwell from Dunbar about the 20th of June, less false as a fact, than impertinent as a reason. His intention of going to the north at all, was to repair to a part of the kingdom, in which he had lately had a considerable interest ceded to him by the Queen. In the marriage-contract of the month immediately before, she had given him “all and haill
 “ [whole] the Erldom, landis, and ilis of Ork-
 “ nay and Lordship of Zetland [Schetland]; with
 “ the holmis—castellis, touris, fortalices, manor-
 “ places,—tenentis, tenandries, service of fre
 “ tenentis;—with the toll and custumis;—to-
 “ gidder with the offices of sheriffship of Orknay
 “ and fowdry of Zetland, and office of justiciarie
 “ within all the boundis als weill of Orknay as
 “ Zetland;—erectit in ane haill and fré Dukry,
 “ to be callit the Dukry of Orknay for evir*.” All this must have created him a vast influence, in the Orkney and the Schetland isles. It was also at the greatest distance, from the seat of usurpation. It was therefore the least likely, to be affected by that awe and terrour, which was sure to be impressed upon the minds of the generality, from the very arrogance and audaciousness of the rebel proceedings. For these reasons, no doubt, he would not repair to his old tenants in Lydisdale, but visited his new ones in the north.

* Goodall, ii. 59. This accounts for the mistake in Crawford, which says he was created Duke of Orkney “and Schetland” (Keith, 385). He had the Earldom of Orkney, and Lordship of Schetland, erected into the Dukedom of Orkney.

And

And he would try to collect a second army among them; and attempt to have another struggle with them, for the possession of the Queen. Their horrible act of perfidy to her, would strengthen his interest, and diffuse his influence, among these late tenants to the Queen. All would induce him to hasten to them. Yet he did not set out, as the journal avers he did, and as the whole story of seizing the letters is made to intimate he did; “about” the 20th of June. *About* the 20th, we are sure that he was still at Dunbar. *After* the 20th, we are sure that he was still there. Even many days after it, we are sure that he was not yet gone. He “staid *at least* fourteen days” there, say Crawford’s Memoirs*. He actually staid two and twenty. He did not set out, before the 8th of July. And we have the testimony of the very rebels themselves, and of their publick and authoritative acts, for this new proof of the spuriousness of all the circumstances, in the asserted discovery of the letters.

Six days after the time specified by the rebels, for Bothwell’s flight to the north; they themselves issued a proclamation, which proves him to have been then in Dunbar. On the TWENTY-SIXTH of June, they made an act of council for letters to be sent to the heralds, &c.; directing them to repair to the castle of Dunbar, and to demand the surrendery of the castle to the executor of the orders, within six hours after notice, “because the Earl of Bothwell was reset and re-

† P. 54.

“received within the said castle*.” Bothwell thus appears evidently from the rebel orders themselves, to have been *at that time* in the castle of Dunbar; though, by the rebel journal, he ought to have been halfway over the sea to Orkney. Nor can the journal pretend to stand, in competition with the orders. These were an open and publick act of council, executed by a deed of great pomp and notoriety, at the moment; while that was a private diary, constructed for private purposes, and fabricated at a late period. But the former is supported by another act, equally as publick and notorious as itself. On the NINTH OF JULY, the rebels first heard of Bothwell’s actual outset for the north. They heard of it, no doubt, within four and twenty hours after it happened. The distance of Dunbar from Edinburgh, only seven and twenty miles, shows they must. They accordingly entered a charge on their council-book, upon the 9th of July; for a proclamation “prohibiting any person *in the isles of Orkney*, to respect or be assisting to him†.” They knew of his outset. They knew of his design in it. And they endeavoured to prevent the success of both, by the force of terrour. Bothwell therefore put to sea on the 8th of July, no less than EIGHTEEN days after the time, *about* which the journal sends him. He was bound for Orkney. But he landed by the way in Murray. His great uncle, Patrick Hepburn, was Bishop of it. In his house, and under his tuition, he had

* Keith, 408.

† Ibid. *ibid.*

been educated *. He therefore went to visit him. And the rebels at Edinborough heard of his landing there, by the 14th or 15th; and again by the 18th. On the 18th, Sir Nicholas Throgmorton writes from Edinborough to Elizabeth. “Captain Clerk,” he says, “—did the 16th of this month—kill one Wilson a seaman;—about the ship which—was appointed by these lords, to go to the north of Scotland, *to impeach the passage of the Earle Bothell*, in case he went either to the *isles* or to any other place.” “By the death of this man,” he adds, “this enterprize was dashed.” “Bothell,” he afterwards says, “doth *still* remain in the north parts; but the lord Seaton and Fleming, *which have been there*, have utterly abandoned him, and do repair hitherwards †.” By the 21st they had received some fresh intelligence, concerning his movements in Murray. He had been entertained by the Bishop, at his palace of Spynie. He had been accompanied by the Bishop, to the houses of various gentlemen in the county. They therefore issued a proclamation for punishing the Bishop, by prohibiting his tenants from paying him their rents ‡. And they had heard by the same day, that in Murray he had “assembled four or fyve small shypes together,” had “equipped and manned the same,” and had already or was just going to put to sea ||. But

* Detection, 55, Anderson, ii; and 256, Jebb, i.

† Robertson, ii. 376 and 377.

‡ Anderson, i. 144.

|| Keith, Pref. xii.

their intelligence in this last article, was erroneous. He did not leave Murray, for several days afterward. On the 10th of August they give a charge in council, for letters to all owners of ships, skip-pers, and mariners in Dundee; to be ready in five hours with their ships, for pursuing Bothwell and his company; who “haveing rest and spulzeit
 “diverse schippis, als weil pertaining to his
 “Hieness [the new and infant King’s] awn sub-
 “jectis, as unto strangeris, freindis, and conse-
 “derattis of yis realm, accompaneit with cer-
 “tain notorious pyrattis, *ar past to the sey*; mynd-
 “ing to continew in yar reif and pyracie, baith
 “aganis the subjectis of yis realm and all na-
 “tionis; *and first are begun, at his Majestie’s*
 “*propper landis of Orkney**.” A squadron of these ships accordingly put to sea, in quest of Bothwell at the northern isles. And by the 30th of August they had received information, that their vessels were “within forty miles of *Shetland*,
 “where *Bothwell was*,” and that “the principal
 “man of the isle, named Fogge, doth favour
 “Bothwell, it is said, whereby his party shall be
 “the stronger †.” All these papers serve to mark the progress of Bothwell, from Dunbar to Orkney and Shetland, very distinctly. They shew him clearly, to have left Dunbar on the 8th of July, to have reached Murray about the 10th or 11th, to have arrived at Orkney in the beginning of August, and to have reached Shetland about the middle of it. They all unite together,

* Anderson, i. 145—147.

† Keith, 458—459.

to form a regular chain of intelligence. Each links with the other. Each lends an additional strength to each. And all serve to show the reason assigned, for Bothwell's sending after the letters on June the 20th, because "about that tyme he fled be sea to the north;" to be as much a forgery, as all the other circumstances of the discovery have been proved to be; to stand in direct contradiction, to the genuine dates of his motions; and to concur with all the other parts of the pretended fact, in sinking the whole under its own load of absurdity and falsehood, for ever.

§ III.

WE have thus buried the rebel account of the seizure of the letters, in the grave of its own infamy. But let us raise it from the earth again, and call it to a new and a severer trial. We have examined all the *circumstantial* parts of the story. Let us now examine the *essential*. Let us come to the main fact itself. We cannot be too particular, in exposing this fundamental incident to the whole history of the rebels. And we shall see at last, instead of Dalglish and the letters being seized on the 20th of June, that *he* was not apprehended till nearly a month afterwards, and that *they* were not in existence till some time after his apprehension. So open to assault on every side are the accounts, which the rebels have given us of the first appearance of the letters!

These accounts indeed are only such as the
R 3
rebels

rebels fabricated for the publick, long after the period assigned for the events. This appears in part from the date of them, the *earliest* of the narratives being FIFTEEN MONTHS posteriour to the events, and the *fullest* of them being TWO YEARS AND A HALF. And it will appear in the whole decisively, by only comparing them with the accounts, which the rebels themselves gave AT THE TIME. They had no gift of foresight. They had no prescience, of what they should find it requisite to say afterwards. They therefore asserted incidents to be true at the moment, some of which were true, and some were false; but all proved the falsehood and the spurioufness, of the incidents asserted afterwards. And we need only contrast the latter with the prior accounts, to see the forgery concerning the discovery of the letters, displayed in the strongest colours*.

When the letters were first seized by the rebels, they must have been a prize of so much consequence to their schemes; that the acquisition would give a loose to their tongues, and a play to their pens, which nothing could have stopped for a time. In how important a light they actually considered them, *nearly six months afterwards*; we see in a council, which they held on December the 4th, 1567. Then, wanting to found their actions on the best ground possible for their advantage, in order to impose upon the coming parliament; they could find no better,

* This argument was suggested by Dr. Stuart, who has opened it in part with equal vigour and judgment, in i. 358—360, and 363—368.

than this of the letters. “The matter,” they say, “being largelie and with gude deliberation
 “reſſonit at great lenth, and upon fundry daies;
 “at laſt all the—lordis—can find no other way
 “or moyen [means], how to find or make the
 “ſaied ſecuritie,” but by fixing their vindication
 on the footing of the letters. Theſe, they add,
 will vindicate all that they have done, and *all
 that they ſhall do* likewise *. In ſuch a gigantick
 form, is this correſpondence brought forward by
 the rebels, even at that diſtant period;

With Atlantéan ſhoulders, fit to bear
 The weight of mightieſt USURPATIONS!

Six months preceding therefore, juſt after the
 firſt interception of the letters, and at the very
 moments of it; the rebels muſt have infinitely
 triumphed in their own good-fortune, and have
 infinitely insulted over the fate of their fallen
 princeſs. Every act of council muſt have founded
 their joy, among themſelves. Every proclama-
 tion muſt have diffuſed their diſcovery, over the
 kingdom. Both would have united, to publiſh
 their own juſtification, and the reprobation of
 their Queen, in the fulléſt and freeſt manner,
 together. The thunder of their publick virtue,
 would have roared with peculiar loudneſs in her
 ear. The lightning of their patriot indignation,
 would have darted with peculiar fierceneſs in her
 face. And ſhe would have ſtood forward to the
 eye of the univerſe, a blackening monument of
 blaſted iniquity.

* Appendix, No. i.

Let us, therefore, examine all the publick and private papers of the time. The interval is not a large one. The documents are not very many. They are at least not so many, as to distract us with their multiplicity. Yet they are enough, to convince us by their united evidence. And let us see, if we can find this justly expected appearance of things in them.

Fortunately, at the first step, we can brush up close to the very 20th of June. We have a paper of the very day after it. On the TWENTY-FIRST of June 1567, the rebels held a council. We have a minute of it, and of their transactions in it, upon the council-books. The very principals of the rebellion, who were present, are all specified. And amongst the rest we have MORTON, the very seizer of the letters the day before. Here therefore we shall have an amazing burst of exultation, upon the glorious incident of the day preceding. Morton will lay the whole transaction, with pomp and solemnity, before them. They will expatiate with a gay formality, upon the mighty service which he has thus rendered, to the cause of protestantism and rebellion, liberty and usurpation. They will return him their set thanks, in the name of the whole community, for the meritorious deed that he has done. And all will be recorded, in the most ample and expressive manner, upon their council-books. Yet what is our astonishment, when we read the real minute of the council on that day? This is the first council, in which they assumed to themselves the appellation, by which they
continued

continued ever afterwards to act ; that of Lords of the Secret Council *. They were therefore actuated with a higher insolence of rebellion, than they had felt before. Yet THEY SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. This is astonishing indeed. The members present were many, Morton, Athol, Glencairn, Mar, Hume, Ruthven, Semple, Sanquhar, and Ochiltree. These command the Lords, advocates, writers, and all other persons, belonging to the Court of Session, to return to Edinburgh, and administer justice as before ; promising them safety in the execution of their respective offices, threatening them with punishment if they do not, and assuring the people at large, of a security to their persons in their attendance on the court †. They were thus endeavouring to model their usurpation, into a regular and orderly form of government. Yet THEY SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. This is equally astonishing. We are now in the very element, in which the thunder and lightning were sure to be generated. We are now at that very point of the element, from which they were sure to issue. Yet the sky is completely clear. Not one black speck is to be seen, within the whole compass of it. And therefore we are fully convinced, that the letters are not yet in the hands of the rebels.

But what we have missed here, we shall find (to

* The privy counsellors of Scotland were previously called so ; Keith, 514, 515, 519, 525, 529, 532, 534, 535, 536, 537, 557, and 579.

† Keith, 406.

be sure) a few days afterward. We have a proclamation from the rebels, upon the TWENTY-SIXTH of June. Here, then, we shall certainly have a formidable communication of the late discovery, of the infamy of Mary detected in the letters, and of the vengeance due to Bothwell and her for their joint crimes. Here we cannot but anticipate a publication, at which even *his* ear will startle, and *his* cheek grow pale. And here at least the rebels will

a tale unfold,
 To harrow up *her* soul, freeze *her* young blood,
 Make *her* two eyes, like stars, start from their spheres,
Her knotted and combined locks to part,
 And each particular hair to stand on end,
 Like quills upon the fretful porcupine.

But “this eternal blazon,” it seems, is not even yet to be made “to ears of flesh and blood.” The proclamation is long and particular. The letters have been now intercepted, these SIX days. Yet IT SAYS NOT A WORD OF THEM. This is even more astonishing, than before.

“Forfameikle,” it says, “as the Lordis of
 “Secreit Counfall, and utheris of the nobilitie,”
 &c. “perfaving the miserabill estate of the com-
 “mon-weall; how the King, the Quene’s Ma-
 “jesties lait husband, was horriblie and schame-
 “fullie murtherit, na tryell taikin thairof, nor
 “punischment execute uppon the authoris, how-
 “beit thai wer knawin weill enough in the sight
 “of men; *hir Hienes awin person tressonabillie*
 “*ravischit*, and thairastir jointit with the Erle
 “Bothuel,

“ Bothwel, principall author of the said cruell
 “ murther, in mariage ;—thairfoir thai haiff
 “ taikin on armes, to punisch the authoris of the
 “ said cruell murther *and ravisching*,” &c. These
 were their reasons for rising in rebellion, on the
 10th of June. They meant to punish Bothwell,
 for the murder of the King, and for the seizure
 of the Queen. They had *then*, as even their
 latest accounts acknowledge, no box of Mary’s
 letters in their possession. But, as those accounts
 alledge, they had *now*. Now therefore they will
 alter their tone, and speak with a different and
 much louder voice against the Queen. And
 they will specify their new-discovered letters, as
 their great reason for doing so. Yet they do not
 alter their tone at all. They still continue to
 speak in the same pitch of voice concerning Mary,
 to the very end of their proclamation. They
 SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS.

Yet they exalt their voice against *Bothwell*.
 Concerning *him* they say, that “ of the murther
 “ now, be just tryell taikin, he is found, not
 “ onlie to have bin the inventor and devyser,
 “ but the executer with his awin handis ; as his
 “ awin fervantis, being in companie with him at
 “ that unworthie deid, hes testifiet.” They had
 now therefore, as they intimate, apprehended
 some of Bothwell’s servants ; and these servants,
 as they tell us, had deposed to all his concern
 with them in the murder. Yet it is evident
 from themselves, that, if they had seized the
 servants, *they had not seized the letters with them*.
 Had they, they could not but have noticed and
 dwelt

dwelt upon the fact with the utmost explicitness. *Nor had they yet seized any of the servants of Bothwell*, whatever they may venture to affirm in this proclamation. They seized not any of them, as I shall soon prove, before the 17th or 18th of July; *three weeks posteriour to this proclamation*. They show indeed in this very passage that they had not, by the exaggerations so natural to dissimulation; when they speak of his “servantis” in the plural number, though in their accounts before it was only one servant of his, even George Dalgleshe; and when they say, that “by just tryell taikin” he had been proved to be concerned in the murder, though no trial had or could possibly have been taken, and though all Scotland must know none had or could have been. Such was THE BRAVERY OF FALSEHOOD in these men, at the very commencement of their course of profligacy!

But this extraordinary passage, proves still more against them. *It proves their own concern in the murder*. It shows their complete acquaintance, with all the circumstances of the fact. They say, that Bothwell was “not onlie the inventor “and devyser” of it, “but *the executer with “his awin handis; as his awin servantis*, being “*in companie with him* at that unworthie deid, “hes testifieth.” We know it to be true, that Bothwell was personally assisting at the murder, and that his servants were personally assisting with him. But *they* could not know it *at that time*, unless they had been personally assisting with both. These particulars were not known to any

but the conspirators themselves, as I shall soon show from an authentick document of the time, before the 17th or 18th of July afterwards. Yet the rebels knew it all beforehand. They knew it, because they were concerned in the murder with Bothwell. Morton particularly, their present leader, was judicially convicted of a concern in it afterwards. And he and they, in the over-acting of their pretended zeal against Bothwell, were weak enough to tell some circumstances of the murder to the publick; which demonstrated their own share in the murder, to every reflecting mind. Such was THE WILD ERUPTION OF FOLLY in these men at present, betraying their own guilt, and pronouncing their own condemnation!

Yet, in this proclamation, they order the heralds to proceed to the market-crofs of Edinborough, and all other places necessary; to publish their proclamation there; and so to prohibit all persons, from receiving Bothwell into their houses, or lending him any assistance out of them, “under the pain to be repute—as plane partakeris
“with him, in the said horibill murther, *ravisch-*
“*ing*, and uther—crymes—committit be him,” and of being punished accordingly. They also add, that “quasomever will taik the said Erle,
“and bring him to the burgh of Edinburgh,
“to be punishit be justice for his demeritis; shall
“haiff, for thair reward, *ane thousand crownes of*
“*the sone* *.” They thus show the keenest alacrity

* Anderson, i. 139—141. So Throgmorton says in France,

crity to slander Bothwell, and to destroy his fortunes. Yet THEY SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. They even prove they had *not* the letters in their possession at present, by speaking at the very close, of punishing him for the *seizure of the Queen*. This the letters taught them afterwards to consider, as no seizure at all; as a mere act of collusion between him and her, in order to make way for the marriage. And their own account of intercepting the letters on the 20th of June, is completely disproved by this proclamation of their own at the time, in that first and principal part of it, the date.

On the very same day with the date of this proclamation, as I have shown in the last section; they commanded the heralds to go to Dunbar castle, and demand the delivery of it within six hours, because it had received Bothwell into it.

France, that he lost "above the value of fixe thousand crownes of the sonne" (Forbes, ii. 37). Lord St. John of Scotland also, in order to get his preceptory of Torphichen in 1563, erected by the Queen into a parliamentary barony, "instantly paid down ten thousand *crowns of the sun*" (Douglas's Peerage, 670). And Knox in 1561 speaks of a man at Edinborough, "that spoyled Johne Moubry of ten *crowns of the sone*" (P. 270). It was a coin in silver, I suppose, having the sun and a crown impressed upon it, the same with what was commonly called a French crown also, and six and eight-pence in value (Forbes, ii. 145, 161, 293, 335, and 470). So Knox reports the value of Queen Elizabeth's fount of gold, which was worth 1043l. 19s. (Keith, 357), to have been worth "*thrie*," a misprint for *thirty*, "thousand crownes" (Knox, 400); estimating the crown at six shillings and eight-pence, and only dropping the fraction of 43l. 19s. from the sum total.

Yet

Yet in this, as well as in the proclamation, THEY SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. And, in such a case as this, the argument of their silence is as full an evidence, of their not having the letters at present ; as is any incidental mention, of circumstances contrary to the letters.

We have afterwards no other papers of the time, till JULY THE SECOND. Then the rebels thought it for their interest, to allure the city of Edinburgh into their association. This capital of Scotland, like our own capital, was always ready to lend its ear to the clamours of sedition, and to give its hand to the operations of rebellion. All great towns are naturally impregnated, from the collected multitude of their inhabitants, and from the consequent predominance of vulgarity over sentiment, with the principles of faction and folly in their very constitution. Thus our own London has in all ages been distinguished, by that low turn of thinking, which makes it only a box of tinder, ready to catch fire from any, the clumsiest, applications of imposture. Edinburgh was a mere London at this period, though upon a scale of importance and activity, much more contracted. It was equally willing to present itself, as a humble dupe to the designs of the factious. MORTON and Athol therefore, the first a presbyterian, and the second a papist, in the name of others, who were neither papists nor presbyterians probably ; appeared by agreement in the city-council on the second of July, and invited the city in form to sign a writing of association

association with them. And they produced a writing for the purpose, which the citizens agreed should be signed immediately, by their provost, in their name. Yet even this writing SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. It was merely the same writing indeed, which the rebels themselves had signed on the SIXTEENTH of June before. “2. Julii, 1567,” says the register of the town-council,—“compearit nobil and mich-
 “tie lordis, my Lordis Erlis of Mortoun and
 “Atholl; having with thame the maist honour-
 “abil and godlie band, laitlie maid and sub-
 “scrivit be *ane greit partie of the nobilitie* of this
 “realme,” &c. This band was subscribed “be
 “*thair lordschips, and utheris of the nobilitie* of
 “this realme;” as an *attested copy* of *this* act of the city-council, with a very remarkable recoil from falsehood in the original to truth in the copy, states the real fact to have been; upon the 16th day of June before, *four days antecedent* to the affirmed seizure of the letters*. And this, like that, obliges the subscribers, “upon the
 “respect of thair dutie toward thair *Soveraine*,” to see the murder punished, the Queen’s marriage with Bothwell dissolved, and “our said Sove-
 “raine to be *releivit* of the thraldome, bondage,
 “ignominie, and schame, quhilk scho hes suste-
 “nit and underlies through the said Erlis occa-
 “sion †;” a full and complete evidence, that the rebels were no more in possession of the let-

* Anderson, i. 134.

† Keith, 409, and Anderson, i. 137.

ters on the 2d of July, than they were on the 16th of June before.

The next paper that we have of the time, is an act of council dated the SEVENTH of July. It is now more than a *fortnight*, since the pretended seizure of the letters. Yet in all the public documents, that have been hitherto issued by the rebels themselves, there is not a single syllable concerning them. When therefore did the letters first appear in reality? Whenever they appeared, they certainly appeared not upon the day stated by the rebels. And they consequently come forward to us at once, with all the tokens of forgery about them. But let us pursue the track of light that we have been following, and trace it with a patient activity onwards, till it leads us to the very appearance of the letters. We shall thus fix a double note of falsehood, upon the asserted seizure of them. And we shall see the letters themselves sinking before us, under a double load of forgery. In this act of July the seventh, then, the rebels take a bolder step than ever. They had already seized the power of the crown. They had already seized the moveable property of it. They now made a seizure of its patrimony. They took the Queen's hereditary revenue from her, by prohibiting all payments to the Queen's comptroller; under penalty to the payers, of paying the same over again, and of suffering under their usual engine of terror to the nation, by being condemned as parties in the murder of the King. Yet THEY SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS, to justify their conduct,

duct. They even show, that they had *not* the letters at all. For they still continue to speak, as they spoke *before* the 20th of June, concerning Bothwell's seizure of the Queen. And the penalty denounced against all who paid their rents to the comptroller, is not merely to be punished as parties in the murder, but to be also punished as accessaries to the Queen's seizure. They are to be "pursued, as art and part of the King's "murder AND THE QUEEN'S RAVISHMENT *."

On the NINTH of July, we have another act of council. Yet even this SAYS NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. It only forbids "any person "in the isles of Orkney, to respect or be assisting "to" Bothwell †.

Below the ninth of July therefore, and NINETEEN days after the 20th of June, we are sure that the rebels had not yet got the letters into their possession. We have seen much zeal against Bothwell; yet we see no intimations concerning the letters. We have seen some against Mary; but it has been all covered and disguised. The marriage of the Queen with the Earl, is repeatedly urged as an intolerable offence in itself; and is always attributed to the force, which he put upon her person. That the murderers of the King were not punished, is equally dwelt upon, as a stain and stigma of dishonour upon the whole nation; and is equally ascribed to the influence, which he had gained over her mind. So cautiously did the rebels proceed at first

* Keith, 410—411.

† Ibid. 408.

against the Queen, even after they had entangled her by the seizure, and fettered her by the marriage! Almost all their *publick* activity of calumnation, was confined entirely to Bothwell. Nothing was *publickly* said against Mary, except by distant inferences and secret insinuations. And thus, though they had the impudence to imprison her person, they had not the effrontery to calumniate her character. This shows very clearly the good opinion, which the generality of the nation entertained of her at present, notwithstanding the murder, the seizure, and the marriage. But it shows much more clearly still, the absolute non-existence of the letters at this period. When they fabricated the letters, they must have totally altered their plan of conduct. When they produced the letters, either by description or by exhibition; the publick must have been equally changed, in their mode of thinking. Then it was, and not till then, that their thunder began to roll, and their lightning to flash, against Bothwell and Mary united. At present their lightning, even against Bothwell, is little more than the playhouse lightning of brimstone. And their thunder against Mary is not even so much, as

The playhouse thunder of the mustard-bowl.

We thus leave the publick papers of the rebels, because we can now come to some private ones, that give us intelligence equally derived from the rebels, and more circumstantial and full.

We now come to Throgmorton's dispatches to Elizabeth. Sir Nicholas Throgmorton was sent into Scotland by Elizabeth, on the infamous violation of every principle of honour, duty, and decency in the rebels; when they locked up in a prison the amiable and worthy Queen, who had come over to them in a too dignified reliance upon the probity of wretches, that had scarcely a grain in their whole composition. But they were twin-souls to Elizabeth. They, like her, could make the most sacred promises, and break them instantly. They could pretend to the most exalted principles of Christianity, and yet do what a heathen would have blushed to do. Their Jupiter laughed at the perjuries of rebellion. And they were some of the most abandoned miscreants, that the history of human hypocrisy holds up to our view. But Elizabeth *now* pretended to pity the Queen, to take part with her, and to resolve upon her restoration to liberty. She accordingly sent Throgmorton as her embassadour into Scotland, with instructions dated the 30th of June; to demand her liberty from the rebels; and to threaten them with the vengeance of England, if they did not comply. They did not comply, yet no vengeance was hurled down upon them. They positively refused, at the very opening of the business, to release the Queen from her prison. And they at last turned the very solicitations of Elizabeth for the release, into a reason for carrying their measures against the Queen to extremity, and for forcing the Queen to resign up her crown for ever. Yet

Elizabeth made not a single movement of hostility, to resent the additional insult shown to the Queen, and to avenge the additional indignity offered to herself. She, who had been so prompt before, and was so prompt afterwards, to line the cause of rebellion there with her aid; and who, by sending only one thousand men into Scotland at this moment, might have re-established the whole kingdom upon its natural center of rest again; sent not a single soldier into Scotland now, to effectuate her own purposes, and to support her own consequence, in the delivery of Mary from her prison. To have done this indeed, would have been to act with a dignified policy. But Elizabeth's was all of the low kind. She had not agility of soul enough, to mount up to the other. She, like the serpent which she rivalled in cunning and in mischief, was always crawling upon the ground. And at the very time that she was sending Throgmorton into Scotland, under pretence of procuring the release of Mary from the prison of the rebels; we incidentally know her to have been acting, by her prime minister Cecil, in a vigorous concert with them.

On June the twenty-sixth, only four days before the date of Throgmorton's instructions; Cecil wrote to the English embassadour at Paris, in these significant terms. "At this time," he says, "I send unto you *certain packets of letters* left here *by Mr. Melvin*, who lately came hither from the Queen of Scots." This was Sir Robert Melvill, who was sent in the preceding month

month of May, and just after the Queen's marriage with Bothwell, to explain the reasons of it to Elizabeth *. "The sending of these" packets, adds Cecil, "TO MY LORD OF MURRAY, requireth *great haste*; whereof you may not make *the Scottish embassadour privy*." Yet Melvill, though equally an [embassadour from Mary, was such a perfidious wretch; as to carry them to London for the rebels, even while he was going in a publick capacity for Mary. "But I think," says Cecil, "you may make Robert Steward," the reputed assassin of a French president, "privy; with whom you may confer, for the *speedy* sending away of the same letters. His *RETURN INTO SCOTLAND IS MUCH DESIRED OF THEM*." So early had the rebels prepared their measures of usurpation; so closely were they united with Murray in them; so particularly did they request his return into Scotland, even in the month of May, when he had only left them on the ninth of April before †; and so fully was Elizabeth in the secret of all! "And," as Cecil goes on, "*for the weal both of England and Scotland*, I wish he were *here*: and for the manner of his returning, touching his *safety*, I *pray* require Mr. Steward to have *good care*." Elizabeth and Cecil, we see, were uncommonly solicitous for the safe return of this darling babe of grace, to co-operate actively with the rebels and with Elizabeth, and to lend his hand and

* Anderson, i. 89 and 102—107.

† Appendix, No. x.

head in destroying his sister. All this reflects a strong light back upon Elizabeth's proceedings, at the conferences in England. It shows her flagitiousness, still more plainly than before. It shows she was only acting then the same part, which she had been previously acting. And she was only finishing her career of profligacy. But she was not content *at present*, to do all this by her faithful Cecil, in favour of the conspirators against Mary. She did more. As he had written the letter above, a few days *before* Throgmorton set out for Scotland; so he wrote another, a few days *after* Throgmorton set out. On the 14th of July he wrote thus: "If MY LORD OF
 "MURRAY should lack credit for money, my
 "Lord Steward," the Earl of Pembroke,
 "*would have his son give him such credit as he*
 "*hath* *." Elizabeth was fearful, lest Murray's useful return should be delayed by the want of money. Her prime minister therefore writes to her embassadour, to point out the person, who will advance him as much as he wants, without any limitation. And Elizabeth, who by a penurious conduct often starved her warlike expeditions, and deprived them of their full effectiveness, expended her money very freely in all the dirty services of intrigue. All displays the hypocrisy of Elizabeth in the present embassy, very clearly. A mind, long practised in hypocrisy, takes such a settled bend and warp with it; that

* Cabala, 1st part, 128—129, and Keith, 442. See also Crawford, 25, and Jebb, ii. 220.

it cannot be straightened again, but retains its crookedness for ever*.

Indeed the release of Mary, was only the ostensible object of the present embassy. The real aim of it was, to get the prince, the infant son of Mary, into her hands. This is apparent from the continual urgency of Elizabeth concerning the point, during the whole of this embassy, and even for years after it†. The cun-

* Mention has been made in the text, of Robert Steward, as the reputed assassin of a French president. Let me here explain the fact alluded to. "One Robert Steward, a Scottish gentleman, is taken at Paris for the killing of the president Minart; and it is thought, that he and another of his countrymen did that enterprise" (A letter from the two English residents at Paris, Dec. 27, 1559, Forbes, i. 289). This assassination is thus described before. "A president of the parliament," say they on Dec. the 18th, who was "named Mineur, a great persecutor, was by two persones (— th' one on th' one side, and th' other on the other side) flaine with shot of two pistolets; which they discharged at him, as he was going to the palais to sit in judgment" (ibid. 281—282). So much do the two residents, by their non-condemnation of the murderers, and by their actual condemnation of the murdered, as "a great persecutor," appear to justify his assassination. One that we consider as a great persecutor, it seems, is to be assassinated. And let the world judge, which is more impious, a popish persecutor, or a protestant murderer. Yet the residents countenance, and Cecil employs, the very man whom they believe themselves, and whom they report to the Queen, to be a murderer and an assassin. He escaped out of prison on May the 4th, 1560 (Forbes, i. 439), and was now employed by Cecil in this congenial work of rebellion. See also Robertson, ii. 382.

† Keith, 413—414, 420, 422, Robertson, ii. 368, 369, Diff. 23, Goodall, i. 403—404, ii. 325, 329, and 104, Crawford, 358, Salmon's Abridgment of his own State Trials, 23, Haynes, 610, Murdin, 508, and Moyse, 50 and 52.

ning

ning of Elizabeth was perpetually laying snares, for her knavishness. It was now stimulating her to an act, which promised her some security from the Scotch, and which must have terminated at last in the atrociousness of murder. The fate of the mother tells us with an infallible certainty, what would have been the fortune of the son, if Elizabeth had succeeded in her views. But the son was saved from the extended claws of this harpy, to succeed her on her throne, to unite two high-spirited and ever-warring kingdoms in peace, and to lay the foundation of all our commercial greatness. And the mother fell a victim to those political designs, which were originally calculated for the son; and which, if those designs had been carried into execution in all their natural train of consequences, must have involved both the son, the mother, and the whole island, in one common destruction*.

For the execution of Elizabeth's present

* There is a passage in Moyse's Memoirs to this purpose, which is little known, and yet very remarkable. In 1587, he says, and "upon the 27th of May or thereabout, the "[new] Earl of Bothwell apprehended and challenged an "*Englishman*, who was sent into Scotland on purpose to poison "the King's Majesty, or to take him away by some indirect "means. It was said at the time, that he was induced thereto "by the Queen of England and her council. This knave was "examined by his Majesty himself, and confessed the form "of that treasonable enterprize, which I remit to his deposition; and thereupon he was committed to ward, within "the castle of Edinburgh." P. 128. And Mary confirms this intelligence, by a prior one of the same nature. "Wal- "singham," she says in 1586, "as she heard, had practised both against her life and her son's (Camden, Orig. i. 424, Trans. 355).

scheme,

scheme, Throgmorton was selected; who had been on an embassy to Mary before, who appears to have behaved with a paltry policy in it*, and had even dishonesty enough to engage, in this iniquitous measure of Elizabeth's concerning the son. He would have been perhaps a man of virtue and integrity, in private life†. But a new system of ethicks, it seems, had been even then invented for publick life, which discards virtue as a superfluity, and rejects integrity as an incumbrance. Embassadors of nations, and ministers of state, thus think themselves at liberty, and even suppose themselves compelled by necessity, to do many things in their political capacity, which in their personal would deservedly brand them for scoundrels. They may fancy themselves, by this mode of acting, standing nobly forward like the Decii of Rome; and devoting themselves to the DÎ MANES, for the good of their country. And, in reality, they are only acting with all the scandalous dishonesty of a horse-dealer; who will tell ten thousand lies in the sale of a single horse, will vouch them to be truths with the solemnest air of hypocrisy, will afterwards acknowledge their falsity when they have done their intended service, and then laugh at the fools that were cheated by a confidence in them. But this was peculiarly the case, with the ministers and embassadors of Elizabeth.

Those numerous worthies of the maiden reign, of whom *vulgar* history is so full, were, many of

* Keith, 280, 282, &c.

† Melvill, 46 and 60.
them,

them, only superiour adepts in the immoral policy of a horse-dealer. Throgmorton, particularly, had been bred up in this court. He had imbibed a portion of this spirit. And he shows he had, at his very admission into the activities of his office; when he was now at Berwick on the 11th of July, just ready to enter upon Scottish ground. "I am sorry to see," he then writes to Cecil, "that the Queen's Majesty's disposition
 "altereth not towards the [rebel] lords; for when
 "all is done, *it is they which must stand her more*
 "*in stead than the Queen her cousin*, and will be
 "*better instruments to work some benefite and quiet-*
 "*ness to her Majesty and her realme*, than the Queen
 "of Scotland, which is void of good fame*." This is conceived and expressed, in the very spirit of Elizabethan jockeyship in politicks. All the great principles of religion, were to be given up to the calls of publick expediency. Justice, honour, compassion, and generosity, all that is great in the gospel, and all that is glorious in man under it; is to be trampled upon by the cloven-foot of policy, in order to serve some petty shifts and shuffles, for securing England's and Elizabeth's quietness. Mary was disabled from acting with Elizabeth, in sending her son into England; and Elizabeth therefore was to unite with her enemies, against her. And, as Mary was slandered by her enemies, she was therefore to be crushed by Elizabeth and by them in union, for a woman "void

* Robertson, ii. 365. See also 378—379.

“of good fame.” Such are the poor creatures, that take upon themselves to manage the affairs of nations; and that fancy themselves the best calculated to manage them, because they are poor creatures! But, from this ignoble turn of thinking and acting, Throgmorton won more upon the confidence of the rebels, than a man of more exalted sentiments could have done. He came nearer to their own low level. He was also more open, to all their insinuations against Mary. And, from the joint influence of both, he was the better able to inform us of many particulars, in the assertions of the rebels; which now prove eventually in favour of Mary; and which particularly show their forgery, in this great and initial part of the history of the letters, the pretended seizure of them and Dalgleshe upon the 20th of June.

Throgmorton entered Scotland, on the ELEVENTH of July. He lay that night at Fast-Castle, a seat of Lord Hume's; and was there received by Lord Hume, Lethington, and James Melvill, a brother to Robert the *ambi-dexter* ambassador before, and as *ambi-dexter* as he in his political conduct*. He instantly began with them, upon the business of this embassy. He mentioned his first overture to them from his mistress, the release of Mary from prison. But Lethington, who spoke for the rest, refused to accede to this in the most peremptory manner. “As to the Queen's liberty,” Throgmorton tells us, “which was the first head that I proposed; they

* Goodall, i. Pref. xviii—xxvii and 288.

“said,

“ said, *that thereby they did perceive that the Queen*
 “ *wants their undoing*, for, as for the rest of the
 “ *matters, it was but folly to talk of them*, the
 “ *liberty going before.*” They thus declared explicitly, it would be folly even to treat upon any other points, unless the requisition for Mary’s liberty was previously withdrawn. So resolute were they, at the very first opening of the business, and in defiance of all the threatenings of Elizabeth, to keep Mary still in prison! Yet THEY SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS, in order to palliate this determined severity to Elizabeth.

It now appears also, that the rebels had some time before addressed a letter to Elizabeth, for assistance in money. They knew her well, or they could not have been capable of making such an application to her. They now resent her total neglect of their address. Yet they acknowledge themselves to be more apprehensive, of the consequences of her conduct towards them; than of the interposition of the French, or the opposition of the royalists. So easy was it for Elizabeth at this period, by the smallest exertion of generosity and vigour, to have procured that release by her arms, which she pretended to insist upon by her memorials! Yet NOT A WORD HAS BEEN SAID OF THE LETTERS hitherto, to Elizabeth.

Lethington however, in order to play off France upon England, and promote the views of usurpation by both; disclosed a little of the plan, that was now begun to be seriously agitated among them, and was finally pursued with some variations by them. A French embassadour was coming,
 he

he said, “to deliver them of their Queen for
 “ever, who shall lead her life in France in an
 “abby reclused; the prince at the French devo-
 “tion; the realm governed by a council of their
 “election, of the Scottish nation; the forts com-
 “mitted to the custody of such, as shall be chosen
 “amongst themselves*.” They were thus mount-
 ing already in imagination, to the very meridian
 of their glory and greatness. They were even
 now meditating to consummate all their enormi-
 ties, in that closing deed of villainy, the formal
 deposition of their sovereign. Yet THEY SAY
 NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS.

Throgmorton went to Edinborough on the
 TWELFTH, accompanied by the same persons;
 and reached it that night. The rebel lords in
 town were MORTON, the pretended seizer of the
 letters on the 20th of June before; Athol, Hume,
 Lethington; SIR JAMES BALFOUR, the pre-
 tended deliverer of the letters to the person seized
 with them, and still captain of the castle; Mr.
 James Macgill, and the president of the session.
 But the next day being Sunday, and a day “ap-
 “pointed for a solemne communion” in the town,
 and even, according to the primæval absurdity of
 Presbyterianism, for “a solemne fast” too; he
 could not be admitted to an audience with them.
 He urged Lethington, however, for a speedy ad-
 mittance. He urged MORTON, whom he met by
 chance. In the afternoon Lethington came to
 him. It then appeared, that though the day was

* Robertson, ii. 366—367.

a day of solemn communion and fast, and therefore prohibited them from hearing *him* on the subject of his embassy; yet it had not prohibited them, from meeting and consulting together on the subject. They had heard of the embassadour's intended overtures, from Lethington. He himself now came "on the behalfe of the lords
 "and others," to tell him; that they begged he would defer the audience, till they could send for the absent lords. He also informed him, that they could not even grant him the request which he had made, of having ACCESS to the Queen; for fear forsooth, lest they should offend the King of France, to whose embassadour they had equally refused access before. So resolute were they, in cutting off all intercourse between the imprisoned Queen, and the embassadours of both nations; that they might be at liberty to forge falsehoods, and to create calumnies, against her without restraint. And yet, though, by their posterious accounts, the letters had been now in their possession more than THREE WEEKS; they DID NOT SAY A SINGLE SYLLABLE, CONCERNING THEM.

Throgmorton, having mentioned all this in a dispatch to Elizabeth, then proceeds "to advertise her Majesty of the state of all things, as
 "he has learned since his coming thither." He accordingly speaks of Mary, as "in good health" within her prison. The Lord Ruthven is no longer one of her guards, "because he began to
 "shew great favour to the Queen, and to give
 "her intelligence." She is now "guarded by
 "the Lord Lindsay, and Lochleven the owner
 "of

“ of the house.” She is “ waited on with five
 “ or six ladies, four or five gentlewomen, and two
 “ chamberers, whereof one is a Frenchwoman.”
 But this intimation, concerning the largeness of
 the Queen’s household in prison, we know to be
 a falsehood, imposed upon Throgmorton by the
 rebels. She has here “ five or six ladies,” and
 “ four or five gentlewomen,” about her ; yet, only
 four days afterwards, Throgmorton himself tells
 us, “ she required to have some other gentle-
 “ women about her, naming none.” She has
 here “ two chamberers ;” yet then she requires
 “ to have a varlet of the chamber.” And in fact,
 as we know undoubtedly from herself, she had
 scarcely any of these attendants about her ; her
 whole household consisting of two women, a man-
 cook, and a surgeon. “ *Il s’en on tenue,*” says
 Mary to Elizabeth in a letter of May 17, 1568,
 “ *sans serviteurs que deux femmes, et un cuisinier,*
 “ *et un chirurgien* *.” So lying do the rebels ap-
 pear, in this slight circumstance concerning the
 imprisoned Mary, at present !

The “ Earle of Buchan, *the Earle of Murray’s*
 “ *brother,*” say Throgmorton’s informants, “ hath
 “ also liberty to come to her at his pleasure.”
 Lindsay and Lochlevin “ doe keep her very
 “ straitly : and, as far as I can perceive, their rigour
 “ proceedeth by their order from these men ; be-
 “ cause that the Queen will not, by any means,
 “ be induced to lend her authority to prosecute
 “ the murder, nor will not consent, by any per-

* Robertson, ii. 375, and Anderson, iv. part i. 31.

“ swasion, to abandon the Lord Bothell for her
 “ husband; but avoweth constantly, that she
 “ will live and die with him; and saith, that if
 “ it were put to her choice, to relinquish her
 “ crown and kingdom or the Lord Bothell, she
 “ would leave her kingdom and dignity, to go
 “ as a simple damsel with him; and that she will
 “ never consent, that he shall fare worse, or have
 “ more harm, than herself.” I have transcribed
 this passage, in all its pointedness against Mary;
 to show the desperate promptitude of the rebels,
 to calumniate her at this period. They had al-
 ways been exercising this promptitude in secret,
 even while they were pretending to vindicate her
 reputation, and to rescue her person from the de-
 grading bands of a Bothwell. But they now be-
 gan to be bolder. They wished to win Elizabeth
 completely to them, by their lies. They there-
 fore communicated this slander to Throgmorton.
 Though they had precluded him from all access
 to her, and *then* told him all these calumnies
 against her; yet he was too partial to the cause
 of triumphant rebellion, not to believe all that
 they said of an imprisoned Queen. He there-
 fore received all, without any check from his dis-
 cernment. And he reported all to Elizabeth,
 without any restraint from his generosity. His ge-
 nerosity was overpowered by his policy, and his
 discernment was smothered by his credulity.

What is here said of the Queen, that she “ will
 “ not by any means be induced, to lend her au-
 “ thority to prosecute the murder;” had been
 asserted before by the rebels on June the 15th,

when we know it to be absolutely false. It is also retracted by the rebels themselves, in a letter of Throgmorton's just after the present. In this he acknowledges from them, that, in a *letter* of the Queen's to them, "she yieldeth in words;" and therefore in reality, as words were all that were asked by them, and all that could be given by her; "to the prosecution of the murder*."

With regard to the other point, her asserted attachment to Bothwell; the whole relation is directly opposed by a fact, and the private anecdote confronted by publick history. Mary had actually abandoned Bothwell, near a month before. She had abandoned him in open day, in a most striking manner, and in the presence of her own and the rebel armies. This all history testifies. And any accounts of her spirit and speeches afterwards, that are contrary to this; and that are at the same time derived from men, who were at once the usurpers of her power, the prisoners of her person, and the only possible reporters of her temper and sayings in prison; are as light as vanity itself, in the scale against it. But this very mass of calumnies, was revived afterwards by the rebels, and formally brought against Mary at the conferences in England. Mary, by this means, had an opportunity of knowing and answering it, through her commissioners. Her answer is clear and strong. It runs thus. "Thay," she says, "nor nane of thame, either *befoir* the marriage nor *efter*, cam to her Hienes, as the part of

* Robertson, ii. 375. And see Cabala, 1st part, 128.

"trew

“trew subjects should haif done; knowing at
 “that tyme, as thay affirme, the contrare [that
 “Bothwell was concerned in murdering the King];
 “either *privatelie* or *oppinly* to find fault with the
 “said Erle, concerning the murder forsaid; or
 “yet in any wayse seemit to *grudge* or *disallow*
 “the said marriage, *unto sic tyme* thay had prac-
 “tizit *the keipar of the castell of Edinburgh*, and
 “*provest of the town*, to be *thair assistaris*; and
 “then secreitlie tuke armis, and upon the sud-
 “dan, on the nyght, with thair forces environit
 “the castell of Borthwik, quhair her Majestie
 “was in quiet and peaciabill manner. So that
 “*thair first warning*, was *be sownd of trumpet* and
 “*thair sycht in armis*. And her Grace eschaping
 “to Dunbar, quhairthrow thay could nocht at-
 “tain to thair conspyrit purpos, [they] returnit
 “suddenlie to Edinburgh; raisit bandis of men
 “of weir, set out thair proclamatiounis, *affirming*
 “*the same to be for her relief*, [and] umbesett
 “hir way betwixt hir Grace’s castellis of Dunbar
 “and Edinburgh. And her Majestie willing,
 “for the tender luif her Hienes bair her sub-
 “jectis, to stanch all effusioun of blude amongis
 “thayme; *did nocht prefer the impunitie of the*
 “*Erle Boythwell to her awn honor*, in seeing him
 “*conwoyit away*” [which was an additional slan-
 “der of theirs], “as in their answer is contenit:
 “For thay, being on the feild in arrayit battell
 “aganis hir Majestie, send [sent] the Laird of
 “Grange to hir Hienes, and desyrit her Grace
 “to *caus* the Erle Boythwell *pass off the feildis*,
 “alleging him suspect of the said cryme, *unto*

“ *the tyme the caus mycht be tryit*; and that her
“ Grace wald pass with thame, and use the
“ counfall of her nobilitie, and *thay sould honour,*
“ *serve, and obey her Majestie as thair Princes and*
“ *Sovereigne*: And upon thair promise, for eschew-
“ ing of bludshed, as said is, her Majestie con-
“ sentit thairto, and passit with the said Laird of
“ Grange to thame; quho at the samyn tyme
“ TUK THE ERLE BOYTHWELL BE THE HAND,
“ and BAID HIM DEPART, PROMISING THAT NA
“ MAN SHOWLD FOLLOE NOR PURSEW HIM;
“ and swa, BE THAIR AWIN CONSENT, HE PAST
“ AWAY. And gif they had bene myndit to
“ persew him onlie, they wald nocht haif left the
“ doing of all diligence was possible, quhairthrow
“ he mycht haif bene tane; bot fra [from the
“ time] thay had gottin her Majestie’s persoun
“ in their handis, thay maid *na travell nor persuit*
“ *aganis him, sa lang as he was in the countrey neir*
“ *thame*, quhair he remanit *ane gryte space*, and
“ mycht haif apprehendit him more esilie; nor
“ quhair [for] *lang tyme*, he being furth of the realme
“ and unrecoverabill, *maid ane colorit maner of*
“ *seiking him upon the sey*: as now it appeiris ma-
“ nifest, it was nocht him they socht, bot thair
“ awin particular profit; quhairthrow to all men
“ of haill judgement it may appere, hir Grace pre-
“ ferrit nocht his eschaiping and impunitie, to hir
“ awin honour; for quhatsoever was left ondone in
“ that behalfe, it may maist justlie be laid to thair
“ awin charge. And thairafter, *at her Grace’s*
“ *first cuming to thame on the feildis*, the Erle of
“ MORTOUN said to hir Majestie *with gryte re-*
“ *verence,*

“ *verence*, Madame, hair is the place zour Grace
 “ should be, and we will HONOUR, SERVE, and
 “ OBEY ZOW, AS EVER THE NOBILITIE OF
 “ THIS REALME DID ANY OF ZOUR PROGENI-
 “ TORS OF BEFOIR. And haifing RATIFYIT the
 “ promise maid be the Laird of Grange in thair
 “ names, hir Majestie passing with thame to
 “ Edinburgh, *being ludgit in ane sempill burges*
 “ *hous* (setting asyde her awin pallaces and cas-
 “ tellis), and *ruidlie and rigourouslie entreatit be*
 “ *thame*, contrare thair promise, being thair
 “ Princes and Sovereigne; it was na wonder, in
 “ case her Majestie had gevin thame quick and
 “ scharp answeris, (as we belief) nocht unreason-
 “ ablie. Bot [she] WAS ALWAYS CONTENT,
 “ tuitching ONY thing allegit be thame, TO OF-
 “ FER THE SAME TO BE REFORMIT, be the tryall
 “ of the haill nobilitie and estaitis of the realme,
 “ *her Grace being present and heard*; and TO THAT
 “ EFFECT DIRECTIT HER SECRETARE LE-
 “ THINGTOWN, TO THAIR COUNSALL that held
 “ her captive at that tyme, and WAS ALUTERLIE
 “ [utterly] REFUSIT THAIROF; and maid NA
 “ offer to leif the realme, that her Grace mycht
 “ possesse the Erle Boithwell, as thay allege.
 “ And thairefter her Grace was secretlie con-
 “ voyit perforce, and aganis her will, in the
 “ nycht; and imprisonit within the fortalice of
 “ Lochlevin *.”

This

* Goodall, ii. 164—166. Yet in Cabala, part 1st, 128,
 Cecil says; that Mary on the 15th of June, “yielding her-
 “ self to the [rebel] lords,” as if she had not ordered Both-

This is a full and circumstantial answer, to the original flanders in Throgmorton's dispatch, and to the additional calumnies fabricated afterwards by the rebels. They never ventured to controvert the facts in this answer. It stands therefore an eternal monument, of their verbal forgeries against Mary. But it is a monument of something more. The collision of one falsehood with another, has often demonstrated the forgery of both. It does so here. And this was the great reason, for my proving the falsehood of Throgmorton's reported flanders, by so long a quota-

well off the field, left her army, and gone over to the rebels, "*flatly denied to grant justice against Bothwell;*" when she had done all that, the instant before; and when one of the rebel chiefs, the instant before, had taken Bothwell *by the hand*, had bidden him depart, and had promised he should not be pursued: "so as they have restrained her in Lothleven." Dr. Robertson also cites a MS. account of a conference in 1571, written by *Craig, the brother-minister of St. Giles's with Knox, and a full brother to Knox in the bravery of falsehoods*, as I shall show hereafter; in which Lethington is made to declare, that "on the same night she was brought to Edinburgh, he himself had offered, that, if she would abandon Bothwell," when she had actually abandoned him that very day, and when the rebels had that very day urged him to depart with a promise of security, "she should have as thankful obedience as ever she had—: but nowise would she consent to leave Bothwell," when she had really left him a few hours before. Such a scene of Bedlam have we here! Yet Dr. Robertson believes it all, ii. 339—340. edit. xi. Bedlam is no Bedlam to him, if it will but furnish one sorry argument against Mary. And for Lethington's positive opinion of Mary's innocence, see decisive authorities in what I have referred to before (3. 1), Crawford, 105—106 and 114, Camden, Transf. 116—117 and 118, Orig. i. 143, 144, and 145, and Murdin, 164.

tion,

tion. In those, the rebels show their virulent eagerness to calumniate their Queen. The more virulent is their calumny, the greater appears to be their eagerness. They have even gone so far in both, as to report what undermines its own credibility by its exaggerations, and betrays its forgery by its extravagance; that Mary protested she would resign her crown, and go as a simple damsel, to wander over the world with Bothwell. Yet, in all this wild rage of calumnation against her, when they were so desperately bent upon laying her honour and dignity in the dust; THEY SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. Had the letters been now discovered, they could not but have mentioned, and could not but have produced, them. Either way, they would have overpowered the embassadour with them. They would have set their foot firmly upon them; and then shaken the too yielding heart of the embassadour, most effectually, from them. BUT THEY SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. The letters, therefore, were not yet discovered. And the account, which the rebels gave afterward of their seizing Dalgleshe and the letters on the 20th of June, is all a solemn banter upon the credulity of the times.

But we may re-urge the argument with equal efficacy, from another report in the letter. This is very different from the other. It is indeed quite opposite to it. Yet it carries the same look of expressiveness, and speaks with the same tone of energy, in favour of Mary. “As far as I
“can perceive,” adds the embassadour, “they
“intend not either to touch the Queen in suerty

“ or in HONOUR; for THEY DO SPEAK OF HER,
“ WITH RESPECT AND REVERENCE.” If the
letters had been *now* discovered, they could *not*
have intended not to touch the Queen in her ho-
nour, and *not* have spoken of her with respect
and reverence. They must have intended to as-
sault her honour violently, have spoken of her as
an adulterous strumpet, and have loaded her name
with foul imputations of murder.

To these evidences out of this important letter,
I shall subjoin one more. Nor am I afraid of
dwelling too long upon it. In an argument of
this nature, the force of the whole arises from an
accumulation of parts. And the more rays of
intelligence are brought to meet in one centre,
the stronger will be the blaze of conviction.
“ Against the 20th day of this month,” says
Throgmorton, “ there is a generall assembly of
“ all the churches, shires, and boroughs towns
“ of this realm, namely of such as be contented to
“ repair to these lords to this town; where it is
“ thought the whole state of this matter will be
“ handled, and I fear me much to the Queen’s
“ *disadvantage* and *danger*; unless the Lord of
“ Lidington, and some others which be best af-
“ fected unto her, do provide some remedy: for
“ I perceive *the great number*, and in manner
“ *all*, but *chiefly* the *common people*, which *have*
“ *assisted in these doings*, do greatly *dishonour* the
“ Queen, and mind seriously either her *depriva-*
“ *tion* or her *destruction*.—The chieft of the
“ lords which be here present at this time, do
“ not shew so much lenity to the Queen, as I
“ think

“ think they could be contented ; for fear of *the*
 “ *rage of the people.* The *women be most furious*
 “ *and impudent* against the Queen, and yet the
 “ *men be mad enough* ; so as a stranger, over-busie,
 “ *may soon be made a sacrifice amongst them.*” The
 rebel leaders had been artfully working up, the
 spirits of the ignorant and inflammable mob,
 with their private suggestions of slander against
 Mary ; even while they were publickly avowing
 themselves, the assertors of her reputation, and the
 vindicators of her liberty : till at last a storm was
 beginning to arise among the populace, which
 would enable them to throw off the masque that
 they had hitherto worn, and to appear in their
 proper characters. The populace are generally
 as heady, as they are honest ; and as violent in
 their resolves, as they are weak in their under-
 standings. But, though we have seen the lords
 abusively and boldly slanderous against Mary,
 THEY SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS.
 We now see the commonalty openly inflamed
 against her. The men are “ mad,” in their ani-
 mosity to her. The women are still more “ furi-
 “ ous and impudent,” in their speeches concerning
 her. Betwixt both, her honour and her life are
 in danger. An embassadour, even Elizabeth’s,
 and a Throgmorton, was apprehensive of being
 torn to pieces, if he showed himself “ over-busie”
 to avert the threatened dangers. And yet these
 political Bedlamites did not, any more than their
 keepers the lords, SAY A SINGLE SYLLABLE
 CONCERNING THE LETTERS*.

* Robertson, ii. 368—374.

On the SIXTEENTH, Throgmorton wrote to Elizabeth an account, of his transactions with the lords since the 14th, and of their answer to him. But this dispatch is now lost. We have only an intimation concerning it, in a subsequent dispatch. Throgmorton then says to Elizabeth thus : “ It may please your Majesty, you might
 “ perceive by *my letters of the 16th*, how far I
 “ had proceeded with these lords, and what was
 “ their answer *.”

But Throgmorton wrote again on the EIGHTEENTH. “ I have spoken *particularly*,” he says, “ with the Earle MORTON,” who is said to have seized the letters on the 20th of June before ; “ the Lord of Lidington, and Sir JAMES BALFOUR captain of this castle,” who is said to have given up the letters on the 20th. But does he hear any thing of the letters from them ? No ! They still refuse him an audience. They still deny him access to Mary. But they have no *new* reasons for either. They still SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS.

Throgmorton then goes to the news of the day. Robert Melvill, the very man who went as an embassadour from Mary to Elizabeth, in the month of May before, to explain the reasons of her marriage ; who carried letters with him from the present rebels to Murray, and left them with Cecil for him ; came “ from the Queen in
 “ Lochlevin to this town the 6th” [it should be

* Robertson, ii. 374. See also Keith, 420, for another hint concerning a letter of the 16th.

the 16th]* “ of July, and brought a letter from
 “ her.” He mentions the contents of this letter,
as reported to him. He then tells of a secret cor-
 respondence, which he has found means (by Ro-
 bert Melvill, no doubt, acting “ in his vocation”
 of *double* knavery) to commence with the Queen.
 This authoritatively explains the other. In *that*,
 it is said “ she will by no means yield to abandon
 “ Bothell for her husband, nor relinquish him;
 “ which matter will do her most harm of all,
 “ and hardeneth these lords to great severity
 “ against her.” In his letter immediately pre-
 ceding, Throgmorton had told us a reported
 falsehood concerning her, exactly of the same
 tendency. I then took particular pains to refute
 it. But here it is refuted, by his own account
 of his own letter from her. In both, Mary re-
 fuses to renounce Bothwell for her husband. But
 in the latter she assigns a reason, satisfactory to
 the highest delicacy. She “ grounds herself
 “ upon this reason,” says Throgmorton, “ *taking*
 “ *herself to be seven weeks gone with child*; [and
 “ that] by renouncing Bothell, *she should ac-*
 “ *knowledge herself to be with child of a bastard,*
 “ *and to have forfeited her honour, which SHE*
 “ *WOULD NOT DO TO DIE FOR IT †.*” This last
 stroke

* That the date should be the 16th, is plain. This letter
 of the 18th is one of a train, a follower to letters of the 16th
 and 14th. And in that of the pretended 6th Mary desires,
 that Throgmorton “ might have access unto her;” when he
 did not even reach Edinborough, till the 12th.

† Yet Dr. Robertson, in his late edition, has very un-
 thinkingly

stroke is quite in the elevated tone, of Mary's former magnanimity *. It must be particularly pleasing to every dignified spirit. But, to the low-souled policy of a Throgmorton, it naturally appeared to be too high-set. He saw not the evident refutation, that his own letter from Mary supplied, of his former and of his present flanders against her. He felt not this ray of heaven, that now lightened from the mind of Mary. "I have perswaded her," he adds in the disgraceful strain of a cold-blooded politician, in order "to save *her own life* and *her child*, to "choose the least hard condition." Her own life was still threatened, we see. It was threatened too by so speedy a fate, as would involve her child in the same destruction with herself. And yet the very threateners of death to her and her embryo child, DID NOT SAY A WORD OF THE LETTERS. The murder was projected and was threatened, first; and the letters were *discovered* afterward, to justify the threats, and to authorize the project.

"Although the lords and councilors," as Throgmorton goes on, "speak *reverently, mildly,* "and *charitably* of their Queen, so as I cannot "gather by their speech, *any* intention to *cruelty*

thinkingly produced this, and the grand passage before, as united proofs against Mary. So much can prejudice do, with a Throgmorton and a Robertson! See ii. 338—339. edit. xi.

* So on July the 5th, 1568, she says to Elizabeth, "In "that you trust me, I will not (*to die for it*) deceive you." Robertson, ii. 453.

" or

“ or *violence*; yet I do find by intelligence, that
 “ the Queen is *in very great peril of her life*, by
 “ reason that the people assembled at this con-
 “ vention, do mind *vehemently the destruction* of
 “ her.” The respect shown by the leaders, proves
 the letters *not* to have been yet discovered. And
 the malice shown by the rest, coincides in evi-
 dence with it. *This* pretends not to any letters,
 as the reason and ground of its malice. *That*
 precludes every idea of the letters. And this
 Mars and Venus of Scotland, Bothwell and Mary,
 have not *yet* been caught in the iron net of adul-
 tery; and exhibited as a spectacle of derision,
 either to these gods of rebellion, or to the humble
 mortals below them.

“ It is a publick speech,” adds Throgmorton
 however, “ amongst all the people, and amongst
 “ all estates (saving of the counsellors); that their
 “ Queen hath no more liberty nor priviledge to
 “ commit MURDER nor ADULTERY, than any
 “ other private person, neither by God’s laws,
 “ nor by the laws of this realm.” This is the
 first hint that occurs in all the papers of the times,
 concerning any charge of adultery, or concerning
 any imputation of murder, against Mary. Nei-
 ther had been thought of before. They both
 however appear now. But, even now, the very
 imputers of adultery, and the very chargers with
 murder, SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS.
 These were not yet discovered, yet fabricated, or
 yet planned. And the rebel story of their disco-
 very on the 20th of June before, stands peculiarly
 convicted of forgery at this moment.

But, though the letters are not in being, the charges in them against Mary are. The charges therefore were invented first, and the letters fabricated afterwards. This is very plain upon the present passages. The charges were circulated at this period, with a malicious industry, among the lowest and middle ranks of life. They were peculiarly calculated by their nature, to fasten on the minds and spirits of these. Where the intellect is little exercised, and the passions are greatly agitated, which is the case in all such revolutions as the present; and where the principles of historical credibility, are little known and less considered, as was peculiarly the case then with the middle ranks of society in Scotland, and has always been, and always will be, with the lowest in Scotland and in England; any bold and mysterious surmise of slander, any intimation of a dark and dreadful villainy, however absurd in its matter, however incredible in its manner, and however un-founded and un-authenticated in both, will operate with the force of a demonstration. A WARMING-PAN will become pregnant. A whole nation of philosophers and thinkers, once believed it to have been so. The faith has even remained impressed upon their descendants, for two or three generations since. And there are few of our Presbyterians at present, who do not still believe the truth of the story. This astonishing proof of the political credulity of our fathers and of ourselves, may serve at once to illustrate, and to excuse, the bigotry of the Presbyterians of Scotland at that period.

period. An extravagance of credulity, in *political* matters peculiarly, has been, and still is, the degrading characteristick of Presbyterianism in every part of our island. They thus believed Mary to have been guilty of adultery, without a shadow of a reason for it. They then believed her to have been guilty of murder,—because they believed her to have been guilty of adultery before. They reared Pelion upon Offa, and Offa they founded on air.

All this, no doubt, proceeded at first from the artful insinuations of some leaders in mischief. These threw out the tales, to catch the silly multitude. Falling into the hot-bed of popular folly, the seeds there grew up and flourished exceedingly. And then the rebel lords took up their own insinuations from the lips of the vulgar, adopted them for solemn truths, and confirmed them—by the letters. This is a curious instance of that inverted process in knavery, which has often been used, I fear, to impose upon the good people of this island. When there are so many thousands among us, who will pretend to judge of publick transactions, without one atom of knowledge to direct them, and with a large fund of inflammable matter within to mislead them; they are sure to become a prey to the knowing, the artful, and the un-principled. Just so it was, but in a much higher degree, in Scotland then. The rebels had no ground for their calumnies, at the time. They pretended to none. Had they; Throgmorton, who was so ready to report every calumny against Mary, must have dwelt with a
peculiar

peculiar emphasis upon this. Yet they threatened her with deposition, they threatened her with death, and they threatened the child within her with death too. What a picture is this, of the knaves who had breathed the whispers of calumny against her, and of the fools who had inhaled them from their mouths; of the stupidity of these, in believing without reason, and without authority; of the masterliness of those in making a nothing to operate so forcibly for their views; and of the savageness of both, in so accusing and so threatening a lady, who was then supposed to be pregnant, and a Queen, who was and is an honour to their nation.

But, though the accusations had not an inch of ground to rest upon at present, they had afterwards. They were lowered from the situation in which they stood, hovering like vapours in the air, and ready every moment to mix with it. They were brought down to earth, and compressed into palpableness (if I may be allowed the expression), by being attached to the letters. And then, then, the rebel lords themselves could allow, *that they had never had any foundation before*. They could then “find NO OTHER way or “moyen” to vindicate their proceedings, nor “the securitie of them and their posteritie be “ONLY OTHER meane myght be providit and “established;” than by grounding all which they had done or should do, upon the letters*. So plainly, by the confessions of the rebels them-

* Appendix, No. i.

selves, had they not the least authority for all their impudent calumnies against Mary, even when they were most violent in their clamours concerning them; before they discovered the letters! And so plainly, by the passages above, were the letters *not* discovered; *till* the calumnies had been openly circulated, *till* the clamours upon them had been exceedingly violent, and *till* deposition and death had been actually menaced for them*.

But we now come to a passage in the letters, that is peculiarly important. DALGLEISHE is said by the rebels, to have been seized with the letters on the 20th of June. Yet we now find, that not only *not* the letters were then seized, but that even Dalgleshe himself was not; and that, when he was seized, the letters were not seized with him. This is a powerful addition, to all the accumulated evidences of the forgery before. And it comes in the more usefully here, as we have just seen the Queen openly set up by all ranks and orders of the rebels, except the counsellors,

A fixed figure for the hand of scorn
To point its slow unmoving finger at.

“The Earl of Bothwell,” says Throgmorton,
“and all his adherents and associates, be put to

* Throgmorton says, that “Mr. Knox arrived here in this town the 6th of this month.” It is a mistake again for the 16th. In his letter of the 14th, he said before, “Knox is not here, but in the west parts.” Robertson, ii. 373.

“ the horn by the ordinary justice of this town,
 “ named the lords of the session; and command-
 “ ment given to all sheriffs, and all other officers,
 “ to apprehend him, and all other his followers
 “ and receiptors.” The rebels, it seems, had
 induced or compelled the lords of session, and
 all the retainers of the court, to resume the dis-
 charge of their respective functions; by their pro-
 clamations of June the 21st before. Bothwell was
 then “ charged to underly the law” before them;
 and “ yairfoir, in default of finding of fouertie,”
 say the rebels by a proclamation of July the
 21st, “ he is ordourlie denuncit oure soveranis re-
 “ bell, and put to ye horne*.” This appears
 from the present letter, to have been done since
 the date of the last, and only the day before the
 date of this. And let us, before we proceed,
 mark the inconsistencies of the rebels, in their
 accounts of that guilt, for which Bothwell was
 now condemned judicially in his absence.

In their proclamation on June 26th they said,
 that “ the authoris” of the murder “ wer knawin
 “ weill enough in the sight of men†.” In their
 acts of council and of parliament the December
 following, they added, that “ all men in thair
 “ harts were fully perswaided” at the time of the
 murder, “ of the authors and devisers of that
 “ mischevous and unworthie fact‡.” In their
 answer also before the commissioners of England
 they asserted, that, when the King was murdered,

* Anderson, i. 144.

† Ibid. 139.

‡ Appendix, No. i. and ii.

“ James, sumetime Erle Bothwell, *being well*
 “ *knawn for chief author thairaf*, enterit in so
 “ great credit and authoritie with the Quene,
 “ that, within thre monethis efter the murther
 “ of hir husband,” he—seized her; and that
 they took up arms to “ punish the said Erle,
 “ chief author of the murther *.” And yet at
 the very commencement of their rebellion, and
 on June the 12th, they say that they have taken
 up arms, “ *understanding* yat James Erle Bothwele
 “ *put violent handes* in our Soveraigne Ladies
 “ maist nobile persone;” and they add, that
 “ *attour* [moreover] the saidis lordis and nobilitie
 “ *ar* assuredlie INFORMIT, yat the same James
 “ Erle Bothwele—was the principall author, de-
 “ visor, and instrument of the—murther;” and
 this “ appears to be of veritie,” because—the Earl
 was hastily divorced of his wife afterwards, even
 while he kept the Queen confined, “ quhilk
 “ *confirms* the INFORMATION given to the saidis
 “ lordis and nobilitie, of the said Erle Both-
 “ wele †.” Thus he, who was well known to ALL
 to be the authour of the murder, at the very
 time; and of whose guilt they themselves were
 so sure, that they actually took up arms to punish
 it; was so little known at the time to be guilty,
 that they really took up arms to rescue the Queen,
 not to punish him; that they were first informed
 of his guilt, *after* they had taken up arms; and
 that then they were obliged, to couple the divorce

* Goodall, 144 and 145.

† Anderson, i. 131 and 132.

and the seizure with the information, in order to deduce his guilt from all together.

On the 16th of June they dare not rely on the INFORMATION, which they had received on the 12th. They only glance at it now, though it was their principal argument then. They dwell wholly on the circumstances, that were only corroborative before. In a bond of association which they drew up, on the day of sending the Queen away to prison, and in consequence of resolving upon this execrable villainy, they say; that there was “no maner of just tryell takin, nor ment to be takin, for the cryme” of the king’s murder, “albeit, *in all this tyme*, the murthereris “wer *weill eneuch knawin*; for quho culd be ignorant thairof, and not cleirly see it, behalding “the proceiding of Erl Bothwell the tyme of “the attempting that odious fact, and continuing “allie syncesyne? That wer sufficient, althocht “there wer na uther pruiff*.” But on the 26th we find the rebels, rejecting both their deductions and their information, and founding his guilt upon a new point. “Of the quhilk murther “now,” they say, “be *just tryell taikin*, he is “found, not onlie to have bin the inventor and “devyser, but the executer with his awin “handis †.” And yet on the 27th, the very day afterwards, they order William Blackater, James Edmonstone, John Blackater, and Mynart Frazer, to be put to the torture, “for furthering of the “tryall of the *veritie* ‡.” The trial therefore had

* Anderson, i. 134—135. † Ibid. 140. ‡ Keith, 407.

been held before the 26th of June, and yet was still to be held on the 27th. The truth had appeared on the 26th, and had disappeared on the 27th again.

Throgmorton also informs us from the rebels on the 14th of July, that Bothwell has been “with manifest evidence notoriously detected, “to be the principall murderer*.” Accordingly, on the 26th of June before, the rebels declared of Bothwell; that “his awin servants, being in “companie with him at that unworthie deid,” the murder, “hes testifiet” to his share in it †. Yet, on the 27th, four retainers of his were ordered to be tortured, “for furthering of the tryall “of the veritie.” And the two first of his servants, that were ever pretended specifically and by name to be taken, were not taken till the 17th or 18th of July; and then they “confessed *such* “fundry circumstances,” says Throgmorton in this dispatch of the 18th, “*as it appeareth evi-* “*dently*, that he, the said Earl, was one of the “principal executors of the murder, in his own “person, accompanied with fundry others, of “which number I cannot yet certainly learn the “names, but of three of them, that is to say, two “of the Ormiston of Tivot-dall, and one Hay- “born of Bolton: the lords would be glad, that “none of the murderers should have any favour “or receipt in England; and hereof their desire “is, that the officers upon the border may be “warned.” This then was the grand æra of

* Robertson, ii. 371.

† Anderson, i. 140.

discovery, concerning the murder. The trials taken, the detections made, the informations, and the servants, which have been mentioned before, are all as false as they are contradictory. And all form a wonderful addition, to the mass of falsehood and forgery which we have seen before.

But who were these servants of Bothwell, that were now taken, and that now confessed? Let us see Throgmorton's account of them. "The
 " Earl of Bothell's PORTER, and one of his other
 " SERVITORS OF HIS CHAMBER, being apprehended, have confessed such fundry circumstances; as it appeareth evidently, that he, the
 " said Earl, was one of the principal executors of
 " the murder," &c. Bothwell's porter was William Powrie, called "servitor to the Erle Bothwell," in some depositions published by the rebels*; denominated expressly "Powrie le
 " portier," in the second confession of Paris†; and called equally by the preceding depositions in another place, "William Powrie servitor and
 " porter to the said Erle ‡." And the only "servitor of his chamber," that was ever taken or ever pretended to be taken, was, according to the same depositions, "GEORGE DALGLISH, *servande*
 " *in the chalmer* to the Erle Bothwell, of the aige
 " of 27 zeiris or yareby §."

Thus are we come at last to the seizure of Dalglish; but SIX OF SEVEN AND TWENTY

* Anderson, ii. 165.

† Anderson, ii. 174.

‡ Goodall, ii. 77.

§ Anderson, ii. 173.

DAYS, after the asserted seizure of him by the rebels. Nor is this all. Melvill speaks of the seizure of Dalgleishe. But, with his customary confusedness, he unwittingly post-dates the fact, even more than the rebels have ante-dated it. He confounds it, with the general taking of Bothwell's servants in a vessel off Schetland, at the beginning of September following. Bothwell's ship, he says, "Grange took, and therein the
 " laird of Tallow, John Hepburn of Bautoun,
 " DALGLEESH, and divers others of the Earl's
 " servants;—who were the FIRST, WHO GAVE
 " INFORMATION OF THE MANNER OF THE
 " MURDER *." Dalgleishe and Powrie, as we have seen above, "confessed such sundry circumstances, as it appeareth evidently, that" &c. And the rebels have accordingly published their depositions, as prior by months to any of the others †. Dalgleishe also was not seized alone, whatever the rebel journal says. He was seized along with Powrie. They were both seized, in consequence of the sentence against Bothwell and his followers, pronounced by the court of session. This is plain, from the connection of ideas in Throgmorton's dispatch. "The Earl of Bothwell," he says, "and all his adherents and associates, be put to the horn by—the lords of the
 " session; and commandment given—to apprehend him, and all other his followers and receivers: the Earl of Bothwell's porter, and one

* P. 85.

† Anderson, ii. 165, 171, 173, 177, and 183.

“ of his other fervitors of his chamber, being
“ apprehended, have” &c. Dalgleshe too was
not seized, after he was come from Bothwell to
the castle, and as he was on his return from the
castle to Bothwell. Bothwell had now been gone
to the Orkneys and to Schetland, several days be-
fore. Nor was Dalgleshe seized with the letters
about him. He could not, because Bothwell was
gone out of the country. He could not, because
he was seized in company with Powrie. He and
Powrie were both seized together, at the Earl’s
lodgings in Holyrood-house, no doubt; where
they had been both left, the one as porter and
the other as chamberlain to the lodgings, when
Bothwell and the Queen left Edinburgh hastily
on June the 7th; where they had both remained,
when the rebels entered Edinburgh on the 10th
and 12th, when the Queen returned with the re-
bels to Edinburgh on the 15th, and when the
rebels sent her away to prison on the 16th; and
where they still continued unmolested, to the day
of their seizure, the 17th of July. And that
neither he nor Powrie had the letters with them,
is plain from the total silence of Throgmorton,
concerning any letters being intercepted on this
occasion; an incident, which he could not but
have noticed with the “ trumpet tongue” of ener-
gy, if it had happened; and is still plainer, if
possible, from his notice of the letters, as men-
tioned for the first time by the rebels, in a dis-
patch which he wrote several days afterward. The
whole formal and pompous tale therefore, which
the rebels have given us of the seizure of Dal-
gleshe

gleishe and the letters on the 20th of June, appears again for the twentieth time, and appears every time with an additional weight of evidence; to be an impudent effort of experiment, for trying how far the credulity of their credulous party would extend *.

Throgmorton wrote again to Elizabeth, on the NINETEENTH. Matters were now ripening fast to a conclusion. “The repair to this town doth
 “begin to be great,” he says; “and men which
 “kept no place of counsellors, and yet of good
 “regard, do boldly and overtly by their speech,
 “utter great rigour and extremitie against their
 “Sovereign; saying, it shall not be in the power
 “of any *within* this realm, neither *without*, to
 “keep her from condign punishment for her
 “notorious crimes.” They thus charge the Queen with “notorious crimes,” and threaten her with “condign punishment” for them. They thus defy all the efforts of the royalists, and all the exertions of Elizabeth, to save her from their avenging hands. They were mad enough, to fancy the truth of all their surmises, and to intend the execution of all their menaces. Yet these very madmen SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. Dalgleshe had been seized, only a day or two before. Powrie had been seized with him. Their confessions were now the common topick of the town. They themselves were the first, “who gave information of the manner of
 “the murther.” Yet, with all this new light

* Robertson, ii. 374—378.

breaking in upon the publick, the maddest of the rebels SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS.

“ I find,” adds Throgmorton, “ the matter
 “ likely to be brought to one of these four issues.
 “ —The first and best is, to restore their Queen
 “ and Sovereign to her liberty and royal estate,”
 &c. “ The next and second degree is, that the
 “ Queen shall abandon this realm, and—resign
 “ all government—to—her son,” &c. “ The
 “ third end and degree is, to prosecute justice
 “ against the Queen, *to make her process, to con-*
 “ *demn* her, to crown the prince, and *to keep her*
 “ *in prison, all the days of her life*, within this
 “ realm, To this opinion there doth lean (as
 “ far as I can understand) both *the most part of*
 “ *the counsellors, and a great many others.*” Only
 the very day before, Throgmorton has informed
 us, “ that the lords and councilors speak reve-
 “ rently, mildly, and charitably of their Queen;
 “ so as I cannot gather by their speech, any in-
 “ tention to cruelty or violence*.” Only five
 days before, he hath also informed us, that “ they
 “ do speak of her with respect and reverence;
 “ and *do affirm*, as I do learn, that the conditions
 “ aforesaid accomplished,” the murder prosecuted
 and the divorce made, “ they will both *put her to*
 “ *her liberty, and restore her to her estate* †.” Yet
 now, we see, “ the most part of the counsellors,”
 in only five days, and in only one, without a
 single discovery intervening, and SAYING NOT
 A WORD OF THE LETTERS, are so entirely

* Robertson, ii, 377, July 18.

† Ibid. 371, July 14.

changed ;

changed; that they, who were for restoring her to her liberty and her crown, are now for pretending to try her, to condemn her, to depose her, and to keep her in prison for life. The quickness of the transition, shows evidently the artificialness of the change. They had been secretly poisoning the people, with their infamous calumnies against Mary; and they had been artfully deferring the audience of the English ambassador, that they might see the operation of their drugs; before they ventured upon the completion of their measures. And as soon as they saw the delirium, which they had brought on by their potions, to be strong enough to bear them out in all that they intended; they changed their language, without one blush of shame, and they entered upon their measures, without one compunction of remorse. Yet, with all this hypocrisy before and all this flagitiousness behind, they SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS.

“The last and worst degree of all is,” adds Throgmorton, “not only to have the Queen’s process made and her condemnation publick, but also THE DEPRIVATION of her ESTATE and LIFE to ensue. *A great number* do prefer this before the other going before, because they fear they shall want sure means to keep her ALIVE in prison,” &c *. Yet even these fanatic savages, who mounted up in principles at once, to all that eternal disgrace of our country, the regicidal butchery of 1648-9; did not pretend

* Keith, 420—421.

to have any letters against her. They were for trying, condemning, and beheading her. But THEY SAID NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. And yet the very lords could afterwards allow, and with a selfish solemnity maintain; that their conduct past and to come, in imprisoning and deposing their Queen, could be vindicated by “no other way or moyen” possible to be found, than by appealing to the letters.

Throgmorton wrote again to Elizabeth, on the TWENTY-FIRST; and inclosed an answer in form, which the rebel lords had given him at last, to some of his requisitions*. This answer and dispatch were thought to have been lost. But the latter has been found. And the former was only disguised by a false date to it, the 11th for the 20th†. I shall begin with the answer, and end with the dispatch.

The rebel lords still defer his audience, on the poor pretence of the absence of some amongst them; a pretence that would never be wanting, if they chose it. On the 15th‡, it seems, he had presented a “great and large remonstrance” to them, upon their rebellion against the authority, and upon their imprisonment of the person, of their Queen; “putting them in mind, of the duties of subjects towards their natural princes.” They therefore, for Elizabeth’s and his “better satisfaction herein,” do now “declare some part of their intents and proceedings.” Now then,

* Keith, 428.

† Ibid. 417, and Pref. xi.

‡ Ibid. 424.

if they have the letters, they will certainly mention them. And we shall have at last some intimation of this grand discovery, upon which, in the December following, they ground all their past and even all their future transactions, for their full and complete vindication.

Yet we are still doomed to disappointments. They still SAY NOT A WORD OF THE LETTERS. They even say, what evidently shows they had *not* the letters yet. “First,” they say, “we “pray her Highness,” Elizabeth “to conceive “of us, that we take no pleasure to deal with “our Sovereign after this sort, AS WE ARE “PRESENTLY [at present] ENFORCED TO DO; “being THE PERSON IN THE WORLD, WHOM (ac- “cording to our bounden duty) WE HAVE IN “OUR HEARTS MOST REVERED AND HONOURED, “whose grandeur WE HAVE MOST EARNESTLY “WISHED, and, WITH THE HAZARD OF OUR “LIVES, would have ENDEAVOURED OURSELVES “TO HAVE PROCURED IT.” All this alledged honour and reverence for the Queen’s person, all this earnestness of wishes for her grandeur, and all this readiness to promote her grandeur, even at the hazard of their lives; however hypocritical and false, are plainly extended down to the present moment, as proofs that they *now* take no pleasure in what they are *now* enforced to do. Accordingly Throgmorton says in that covering dispatch to this answer, which I shall exhibit immediately: “Now I have by assured intellygence, “(*notwithstanding this smowthe speache, uttered by “theys lordes in thys wrytinge* —), thay bee re- “solved”

“solved” to treat the Queen as we shall soon see. But they could not talk in this “smooth” strain *at present*, if they had intercepted, if they had fabricated, or if they had planned, any letters against her.

They then dwell strongly upon the murder of the King, and the acquittal of Bothwell. Yet the former was executed in concert with Bothwell, by MORTON their leader. And, at the latter, MORTON was not content to have laid his trains in secret, for the deliverance of Bothwell; but stood openly during the trial, within the same box with him *.

They

* See Jebb, i. 403. But Jebb, i. 464, informs us of Morton's standing in the box with Bothwell, at the trial. And Camden, Transf. 94, and Orig. i. 117, tells us what is much more, that Morton undertook the management of his whole cause for him, “Mortonio causam ejus sustinente.” These two notices unite together, to show us the main spring that set the whole machine a going. The four assessors to the hereditary judge, Argyle, were plainly picked out for the purpose; being *all four* warm friends to Morton and the faction, deeply engaged in the rebellion with him, and commissioned with him afterwards to charge Bothwell and Mary with that murder, of which they acquitted Bothwell now (Keith, 375). Buchanan tells us expressly, “that the “murdereris themselves maid the chuse of ye judges” (Detection, 31, ii. Anderson, and 294, i. Jebb). The flaw in the indictment too, which fixed the 9th of February for the day of the murder, when it was actually committed about two on the morning of the 10th; was contrived by Morton, as an additional barrier of security to Bothwell (Anderson, ii. 98 and 114). It was contrived by him, no doubt, in concurrence with one, who was commonly called *Black John Spens*, one of the Queen's two Attornies General (Anderson, ii. 97), though a violent Protestant (Knox, 338); who was probably

They next dwell *more* strongly upon the seizure, and forced marriage, of the Queen. They say she

probably engaged in the murder himself (Anderson, i. 48), who was certainly embarked in the rebellion afterwards (Keith, 452, and Goodall, ii. 370), and of whom, considering his *black* complexion and his *anti-papistical* spirit together, his cotemporaries might with peculiar propriety have said,

Hic NIGER est, hunc tu, ROMANE, caveto.

Morton could not tell, what evidence Lenox might have obtained concerning the murder. He knew Bothwell's guilt and his own so well, as to be clear he might obtain the fullest. And, as the assessors in such a case would have been compelled to condemn, it was requisite to have a second subterfuge. For this reason, also, he added a third. To *prevent* the production of evidence, was better than to baffle it when it was produced. Morton, therefore, provided a body of armed men with a flag, to attend Bothwell to the place of trial (Anderson, ii. 157, and Keith, 405). These were meant only, for a terror to the timid Lenox. They could be intended for nothing else. They could not have rescued Bothwell from punishment, if he had been condemned. A condemnation also was effectually precluded, by the measures already taken. And they could not be calculated to counteract any armed men with Lenox, because Lenox was coming without any (Anderson, ii. 106—107). They were intended, therefore, to terrify only. They were intended, say the rebels themselves, "that nane sould compeir to persew him" (Keith, 405). This they did completely. Lenox had now reached Stirling, on his way to the trial. He there heard of the prepared soldiery. He was alarmed. He stopt where he was. He wrote to the Queen, to defer the trial *on account of his sickness* (Anderson, i. 52—53). And finding the trial was not to be deferred and would come on the next day, he so far recovered himself; as still to determine not to appear, but to send over his servant with a letter to the court, and avow the real reason of his absence. "The caus of his absence," he says, "is the schortnes of tyme, and that he is denyit of his freindis and servandis; quha suld have accom-

panyit

she was “led captive” by Bothwell. They say she was “by fear, force,” &c. “compelled” to marry him. And they consequently had not yet an *idea* of any letters, that should show she was seized by her own management, was married by her own concurrence, and had been an adulterous whore to him before. But they tell us this secret, even more pointedly afterwards. “What rested,” they say, for Bothwell “to finish the work begun, and to accomplish the whole design of his ambitious heart; but to send the son after the father, and, as might be suspected, seeing him keep another wife in store, to MAKE THE QUEEN ALSO DRINK OF THE SAME CUP; to the end he might invest himself, with the crown of the realm *?” The rebel lords *at this time*, it is plain, had not admitted even *one solitary idea* into their minds, of any adulterous commerce betwixt the Queen and Bothwell. The idea indeed had been started among the multitude, but it was not yet admitted by the lords. It never was admitted by them. It first became general among the people, and then the letters were resolved

“panyit him to his honour and *suretie of his lyfe*, in respect of the greitnes of his [Bothwell’s] *partie*, and he having assistance of na freindis bot only himself” (Anderson, ii. 106—107). And, with the same view, Morton appeared in the box with Bothwell, to countenance and to encourage him. All these measures, are only so many gradations in one scale of villainy. They are all parts of one system. They were, therefore, the acts of one directing mind. And this mind, as Camden informs us, was Morton’s. Camden gives the general work to Morton; and Jebb, i. 464, appropriates *one* of the particulars *expressly* to him.

* Keith, 417—418.

upon by the lords. And this forms a most complete vindication of the Queen, from the charge. It not only shows the letters, *not* to have been then intercepted. It shows them not to have been then thought of. It shows the fundamental principle of them all, not to have then existed in the belief, of those hypocritical and calumnious wretches.

But the rebel lords reinforce this striking declaration, by a repetition of it. They even reinforce it, with a pointed addition in their manner. "It behoved us assuredly," they say, "to have recommended the soul of our prince, and of the most part of ourselves, to God's hands; and, *as we may firmly believe*, the SOUL ALSO OF OUR SOVEREIGN THE QUEEN, who SHOULD NOT HAVE LIVED WITH HIM HALF A YEAR TO AN END, as may be conjectured by the short time they lived together, and the maintaining of his other wife at home at his house." And they thus show us in the most convincing manner, that the charge of adultery against Mary was never thought of by themselves, in all their wildest frenzies of calumny against her, while *the King was living*, while *the Queen was a widow*, or while *Bothwell was actually present with her*; that it was never believed by them, even after they had taken up arms, after they had induced her to abandon Bothwell, after they had thrown the Queen into a prison, or after the accusation was firmly believed among the populace; and that the charge of murder, which was founded only on the charge of adultery, must of course

have been later still than this, in its reception among them.

The rebel lords had now gone on, to the last limits of hypocrify. They had been avowing sentiments of moderation to their Queen. They had no thoughts of blasting her character. They had not an idea of touching her life. They meant to restore her to her liberty and her crown. In all this, they were undoubtedly hypocritical. But why were they so? They were waiting to see the influence of their political *charms*, upon the enchanted multitude at the ecclesiastical assembly, on the 20th. If the multitude should then prove to have been deaf to the voice of these charmers, and be for mild measures to their young and amiable princess; then the lords must have acted as they said, followed the inclinations of the populace, and restored their Queen. But, if the people should appear to have been wrought upon strongly by the force of their magick, and to be ready and clamorous for any exorbitancies of usurpation; they should recall all that they had said, wrap themselves up in the tempest that they had raised,

Ride in the whirlwind, and direct the storm.

They were now come to this period. The members of the assembly were all for violence. “Yow harde yesterdaye,” says Lethington to Throgmorton on the 20th, “and somewhat thys
“daye, how bothe yow and I weere publykelye
“taxed in the preachynges, thoughe we weere not
“named: wee must be fayne to make a vertue
“of

“ of necessity, and forbear neyther to doe our-
 “ selves good, the Quene, nor our countrie :—
 “ to my great gryeffe I speake that, the Quene
 “ my Soveraygne maye not be abyden amongest
 “ us : and thys ys not tyme to doe hir good, if
 “ she be ordeyned to have anye.” “ Mr. Knox,”
 adds Throgmorton in this very letter, “ dothe
 “ contynue hys seveare exhortacyons, as well
 “ agaynst the Quene as agaynst Bodwell ;
 “ thretnynge the greate plage of God to thys
 “ wholle countrey and natyon, yf she be spared
 “ from her condigne ponyshment.” Such a de-
 luded idiot in his notions, and yet such a wild raver
 in his speeches, was this ANTI-POPE of Scotland !
 “ The convencion of all the churches,” Throg-
 morton subjoins, —“ dothe houlde ; and thys
 “ daye (being the 21 of this monethe) theye
 “ are assembled in the Tollebowthe, where they
 “ doe propounde such matters, as they intende to
 “ treat of at thys tyme.—They be verye auda-
 “ cyous, and yt appeareth theyre hartes be
 “ mervelowflye hardened agaynst theyre Sove-
 “ raygne ; which God mollesye.” The spirit of
 Knox rested upon them all. They shared in his
 idiotcy. And they partook of his ravings. The
 rebel lords therefore, as we see by Lethington’s
 verbal intimations to Throgmorton, were already
 resolved to throw themselves upon the current of
 popular fury, that ran so strongly in their favour,
 and to float on it to the farthest point, which they
 had ever wished to reach.

Throgmorton accordingly informs us, in his
 covering dispatch to their answer, thus.—“ Your

“ Majestie,” he says,—“ mycht perceyve by my
 “ letters of the 19 of Julye, upon such groundes
 “ as I made my collectyons ; that th’ yssue of thys
 “ great matter heere, was lyke to be determyned by
 “ one of the four degrees and endes, in my sayde
 “ lettres mencyoned ; albeit I dyd pryncypallye
 “ relye by conjecture, upon the twoe laste and
 “ extremest. But nowe I have by assured intel-
 “ lygence (notwithstanding this smowthe speache,
 “ uttered by theys lordes in thys wrytinge which
 “ I sende your Majestie), they bee resolved to put
 “ in executyon forthewith, the coronatyon of the
 “ yonge prynce, with the Quenes consent, yf
 “ they can obteyne the same ; promysynge her,
 “ that her conformyetye in thys matter shall as-
 “ sure unto her, that they meane not neyther to
 “ towche her in honor nor in lyffe, neyther other-
 “ wyse to procede agaynst her judycyallye, by
 “ waye of proces ; otherwyse, they are determyned
 “ to procede agaynst her publykelye, by many-
 “ festacion of suche evydence, as they are hable
 “ to charge her with. And, for the perfectynge
 “ of thys theyre entent, they have sent for all
 “ the lordes and gentlemen, which they thynke
 “ will conjoygne with them*.” The rebels are
 thus “ resolved to put in execution forthwith the
 “ coronation of the young prince,” and conse-
 quently to depose their Queen, either with or
 without her own consent ; at the very time when
 they are declaring, that she is “ the person in

* Keith, Pref. xi—xii. The language of this letter is
 much more *antient* than that of the others, because this is
 printed *literatim* from the original.

“ the world, whom (according to their bounden
 “ duty) they have” to the present moment “ in
 “ their hearts most revered and honoured, whose
 “ grandeur they have most earnestly wished, and
 “ with the hazard of their lives would have endea-
 “ voured themselves to procure.” They are thus
 determined “ to proceed against her judicially,
 “ by way of process,” and “ by manifestatioun
 “ of such evidence, as they are able to charge
 “ her with,” for the murder of her husband ; at
 the very moment, when by their own conjectures
 the real murderer of him, even Bothwell, meant
 “ to make the *Queen* also drink of the same
 “ cup ;” and when also, according to their own
 “ firm belief,” it was most probable the *Queen*
 “ should not have lived with him *half a year to*
 “ *an end.*”

The bane and antidote are both before us.

The rebels had been long in the habit of professing a respect and reverence for Mary, which was directly contrary to their real designs against her. But these designs they could not avow yet. They might never be able to avow them. They might be obliged to resign them up for ever. They must wait to see, how high their own excited tide of faction among the populace would rise, before they could either resign or avow. They therefore went on, speaking only the real respect, which the *Queen's* virtues had long forced, and declaring only the real reverence, which the *Queen's* dignity of mind and spirit had long extorted, from all of them. They even went on in the same strain, when there was

no longer the same necessity for it, when the tide had risen up to their highest water-mark, and they could embark themselves and their designs upon it. From the strong awe, which the Queen's good and great qualities still kept upon their souls, they still stood forth, as the assertors of the Queen's innocence and the maintainers of the Queen's honour; when they had actually resolved to depose her, and, if she would not consent to her own deposition, to charge her with the murder of her husband, and to try her publickly for her life. And thus, when they had mounted up to their highest heights of impudence and calumny, and were now riding the clouds in their extravagancies of imagination against her; by a happy interposition of the idiotcy of wickedness among them, did they then speak in the strongest terms for Mary that they had ever used yet, and did they then present them all upon paper to Elizabeth's embassadour for his mistress: so forming one of the amplest vindications of Mary, and one of the most powerful condemnations of themselves, that is to be met with in all the records of her and their history.

We are now got a full month, beyond the date assigned by the rebels, for the pretended seizure of the letters. But we find that these have not been seized yet. Their own accounts at the time, evince the falsehood and forgery of their accounts afterward. Such dupes have the world been, to the impositions of these men! But we are now coming at last, to some intimation concerning the letters. And this will concur with the silence before,

before, to wring these fraudulent wretches to the ground, and to pin them there for ever.

Throgmorton wrote to Elizabeth again, on the TWENTY-THIRD. But this dispatch is lost. He wrote, however, the same day to the Earl of Leicester*. This is preserved. In it he speaks thus. "This Queen," he says, "is like *very* " *shortly to be deprived of her royal estate, her son* " *to be crowned king, and she detained in prison* " *within this realm; and the same to be governed* " *in the young King's name, by a council consisting* " of certain of the nobility, and other wise men " of this realm †." The plan of proceeding is now settled by the rebels. It had long been floating in their own minds. This is plain from the intimations of it by Lethington to Throgmorton, at their first meeting on the *eleventh* of July before; and from their subsequent execution of it, in all its parts. And at the very time, that they were talking reverently of the Queen, and professing their intention to replace her on her throne; they were acting upon the religious passions, and urging on the honest credulity, of their people, in order to lead them to a formal deposition of her. They particularly stimulated that well-meaning "son of violence" and barbarism, that religious SACHEM of religious MOHAWKS, Knox; to exert all the wonderful influence, which his rude but impassioned oratory

* Robertson, ii. 380. It is dated the 24th. But the sequel shows, that it cannot be later than the 23d.

† Ibid. 378.

had over the people, and to wind them up into madness, for the execution of their villainies. “This day,” says Throgmorton on the 19th, we were “at Mr. Knox’s sermon, who took a “piece of scripture forth of the Books of the “Kings, and did *inveigh vehemently against the “Queen, and perswaded extremities towards her* *.” “He continues,” says Throgmorton on the 21st, to “threaten the great plague of God against “this whole country and nation, if she be spared “from her condign punishment.” They thus accomplished their flagitious purposes. By means of this their principal electrician, and by their own concurrent operations in turning the wheel, the people became so many charged vials of lightning. And then they resolved to discharge it all, under some prudent regulations, against the person of their Sovereign. But let it be carefully noticed, that all this while neither Knox, nor they, SAID A SINGLE WORD ‘CONCERNING THE LETTERS. *He* had “inveighed vehement- “ly” against the Queen. *He* had “perswaded “extremities towards her.” *He* had threatened them all with “the great plague of God,” if she was not put to death for a murderers. Yet he pretended not to speak of any letters against her. *They* also had resolved upon her deposition, upon the substitution of her son in her place, and upon the imprisonment of her person for life. Yet they pretended not, any more than he, to have any letters against her. And, after all, they could

* Keith, 422.

in a few months more assert the letters, to be the only possible ground of justification to them, for that very deposition, that very substitution, and that very imprisonment. They rose in rebellion against her, on the 10th of June. They faced her in rebellion at Carbarrie-hill, on the 15th. They sent her away into prison, on the 16th. Yet they afterwards justified all by letters, which they *said* they discovered on the 20th *. They actually proceeded to accuse her of adultery and of murder, on the 18th of July. They actually resolved on the 21st, to depose her in form, and to sentence her in form to imprisonment for ever. Yet they afterwards justified all by letters, which they *pretended not* to have in their hands *at the time*, and which at the time they *pretended not* to have before the 24th. This, if we consider it as folly, is one of the most striking and eminent acts of folly, that the world has ever beheld. But it ought to be considered in a light, much more dishonourable to the rebels. And, as knavery, it is one of the rankest, that has ever been attempted to be imposed upon the sons of men.

Throgmorton wrote again to Elizabeth, on the TWENTY-FOURTH †. This dispatch brings us, to the final result of all their aims and wishes. “ The Earls of Glencairn and Mar, the Lords
“ Sempil, Ochiltree, and the master of Graham;
“ accompanied with many gentlemen of the west

* Goodall, ii. 63 and 67.

† Keith, 424.

“ of this realm, to the number of two hundred
“ horses ; arrived in this town the 23d of this
“ month : so did the Lord Lindsay also, being
“ sent for by these lords from Lochlevin. *The*
“ *same day* all the lords, and others of the best
“ quality, had conference together concerning
“ their proceedings with the Queen their Sove-
“ reign. And, as I can learn by assured intel-
“ ligence, this was among them resolved,” as
had been resolved by the other lords before,
“ That the Lord Lindsay should this day, being
“ the 24th, accompanied with Robert Melvil,”
that black BAT in politicks, “ repair to the
“ Queen, and have in charge to declare unto her ;
“ that the lords here assembled considering her
“ former misbehaviours, as well in the govern-
“ ment of the realm as in her own person (the
“ particularities of both which misgovernments
“ they would forbear to touch, for respect they
“ had to her honour), could not permit her any
“ longer to put the realm in peril by her disor-
“ ders, which were such and so many, as they
“ could not think meet, that she should any more
“ stand charged with the governance of the
“ realm ; and therefore they did require and ad-
“ vise her to accord quietly, and thereto to give
“ her consent, that her son the Prince might be
“ crowned their King and Sovereign ; and also,
“ by her assignment, that a council might be
“ appointed and established, to govern the realm
“ in his name : And thus doing, they would *en-*
“ *deavour* themselves to save both her life and
“ honour,

2

“honour, both which otherwise stood in great
“danger.”

“Further it was resolved,” he adds, “that
“in case this Queen would not be conformable
“to their motions; then her liberty should be
“restrained to more straitness, and *the ladies,*
“*gentlewomen, and gentlemen,* which be about
“her,” and which, as I have already shown, were
only *two women, a man-cook, and a surgeon,* “to
“be sequestered from her. And as far as I can
“understand, in this case of the Queen’s refusal
“to these their demands, they mind to proceed
“both with violence and force, as well for the
“coronation of the Prince, as for the overthrow
“of the Queen.—I do perceive, if these men
“cannot by fair means induce the Queen to their
“purpose, they mean to charge her with these
“three crimes, that is to say: tyranny, for
“breach and violation of their laws and decrees
“of the realm, as well that which they call com-
“mon laws, as their statute laws; and, namely,
“the breach of those statutes, which were en-
“acted in her absence, and confirmed by Mons.
“de Randam and Mons. d’Osell, in the French
“King her husband’s name and hers. Secondly,
“they mean to charge her with incontinency,
“as well with the Earl Bothwell as with others;
“having (as they say) sufficient proof against
“her, for this crime. Thirdly, they mean to
“charge her with the murder of her husband,
“whereof (they say) they have as apparent proof
“against her, as may be; as well by the testi-
“mony of HER OWN HAND-WRITING, which
“they

“ they have recovered, as also by sufficient witnesses *.”

I have thus thrown all the parts of this very memorable dispatch, that relate to the charges against the Queen, into one extract. They will therefore be seen in one view. And, as each appears to illustrate the other, so the LETTERS appear to give light and lustre to all nearly. The letters are now noticed at last, by the rebel lords of the time. The letters are now to found a charge of adultery and of murder, against Mary. The rebel lords therefore speak in a very different tone, from what they have hitherto used. They speak not only of her mis-government of the realm, but also of “ her—misbehaviours—
“ IN HER OWN PERSON.” *These*, as well as those, “ they would forbear to touch for respect
“ they had to her HONOUR.” Her “ disorders” in *both* had been “ such and so many, as they
“ could not think meet, that she should any
“ more stand charged with the governance of
“ the realm.” And “ both her LIFE and HO-
“ NOUR stood in great danger,” from the resentment of the nation against both. If she submitted to their proposals, they meant to spare her honour and her life. If she did not, they
“ minded to proceed both with VIOLENCE and
“ FORCE, as well for the coronation of the Prince,
“ as for the OVERTHROW of the Queen.” They meant to charge her with adultery and murder,

* Keith, 424—427. Here, with the last part of the quotation, ends all that was written on the 24th. The rest was written on the 25th.

as well as tyranny. And we need only contrast the intentions of the rebels at present, with their own accounts of them merely three days before; to see the difference now the letters are actually appealed to. *Then* the Queen, who is *now* charged with adultery, was declared to have been “led captive” by Bothwell, “and by fear, “force,” &c. “compelled to become bedfellow” to him. *Then* also the Queen, who is *now* charged with the murder of her husband, would, “as might be suspected,” have been made by Bothwell “to drink of the same cup” with her husband, and “should not have lived with “him half a year to an end.” And thus she, who was no adulteress at all then, is now transformed into an abandoned one; and she, who was in great danger then, of being murdered after her husband by Bothwell, is now made a party with Bothwell, in the murder of that very husband.

We thus, after a thousand disappointments, find these fugitive letters at last. But we find them, long after the rebels pretend that *they* found them. So they pretended *posteriously*. But what they pretended *at the time*, was very different. They then did not pretend to have them, and then very evidently had them not, on the 20th of June, the day assigned afterwards for their seizure. They neither had nor pretended to have them, for A WHOLE WEEK, for A WHOLE FORTNIGHT, or even for A WHOLE MONTH, afterwards. They never hinted at their possession of papers, which they must have proclaimed

claimed with the loudest voice of fame; and they uniformly continued to show, that they had them not; till the 24th of July, just FOUR AND THIRTY days after the date of their asserted seizure of them. And the story of their seizing them with Dalgleishe on June the 20th, appears finally to be one of the boldest fictions, that ever was obtruded on the faith of man; being invented within *fifteen months* only from the time, and then sanctioned solemnly by the privy council of Scotland itself; the rebel lords together, thus giving a defiance to all the memories, and all the papers, of the nation; desperately staking their honour, on what was almost sure to be detected immediately; and yet attracting a considerable degree of credibility to the whole, from the very audaciousness of their proceedings concerning it *.

C H A P.

* Since this was printed, Dr. Robertson has endeavoured to answer *one* part of the argument in it, by some poor and petty allegations of *policy*, in ii. 348—355. edit. xi. The rebels did not produce the letters though they had them, he apprehends, *for fear of offending England and France*, by charging Mary with adultery and with murder from them. But my regular deduction of evidences here, had precluded beforehand all this trifling sort of argumentation, which is the usual resort of the disingenuous. I have here proved the rebels, not only *not* to have either *produced* or *noticed* the letters; but to have shown decisively by their *speeches* and by their *writings*, that they *had them not*. And, having said this, I need hardly to intimate, that Dr. Robertson has attributed the non-production of the letters by the rebels, for so many months, to the fear of offending England and France; *when the rebels themselves attribute it*, and at the very time too, in which the Doctor allows they were able and willing to

CHAPTER V.

§ I.

HAVING now, with some portion of a Dutchman's patience, gone over the whole account, which the rebels chose to give posteriorly, of their seizing the letters on the 20th of June; and having demonstratively proved it, I hope, to be charged with absurdities on every side, and even to be contradicted by all the numerous documents of the time: I shall proceed, as I proposed, with the regular history of these important writings. I shall therefore begin first, with the rise and origin of them. I have already disproved the rebel accounts of their rise, and

to speak out freely, in the month of December, 1567, to "that luif they beare unto hir person, wha somtime was "theire Soveraine," to "the reverence of his Majestie, "whais moder she is," and to "thay mony gude and excel- "lent gifts and virtues, quharewith God sometimes indowit "hir;" and so attribute it, for this plain reason assigned by themselves, "in sa far as the manifestation theirow maie tend "to the dishonor or defestimation of the Quene" (Appendix, No. i). Nor need I to dwell upon that striking circumstance in the disposition of the Doctor's argument, the strong and pointed contradiction of the *end* to the *whole*; the Doctor himself in p. 354—355 citing a letter of July 25th, in which those very rebels, who were then afraid of offending ENGLAND, by charging her with *adultery* and *murder* from the letters, actually charge her *then* with *both* from them, and to the very EMBASSADOUR OF ENGLAND himself.

shall

shall now point out their real origin. In a work that intends to trace steadily the course of the Nile, from its beginning to its end; the fountain of the whole, must be an object of peculiar investigation. The source of these letters, like that of the Nile, has long been hid in obscurity :

Caput inter nubila condit.

Some inquirers have come near it. But none have decisively reached it. I have shown it not to be in the *mountains of the moon*, in which the rebels had placed it. I shall now endeavour, like another BRUCE, to find out where it is, and to go directly to the well-spring of the whole. This I hope to do with a success, so far superiour to a BRUCE's; that all shall see, and all shall be satisfied. And I shall then fall down the current, following its bends and curves, and tracing its growing progress to its ample conclusion.

We have already seen the rebels, whatever they latterly asserted, not to be in possession of any of Mary's letters on June the 20th. Nor were they even on July the 24th, whatever they affirmed at the time. This the very manner, in which they mention them, shows. They speak "of her own hand-writing, WHICH THEY HAVE
"RECOVERED." This is all the account that they give us, concerning their possession of the letters. They assert the fact. But they tell not the circumstances. They say not WHEN, WHERE, ON OR FROM WHOM, they "recovered" the letters. A story so devoid of all the necessary adjuncts of time, place, and person, could hardly
obtain

obtain credit, even among the pitiable inhabitants of St. Luke's Hospital. But it appears the more idiotish still, when we compare it with the account of the discovery on June the 20th. *This* is as particular, as *that* is general. *This* carries the air of a story calculated for reception, while *that* prohibits its admission by its aspect at once. And every thinking mind, at the first glance, must reject such a tale from such men, with the scorn of indignation.

The rebels also *act* in such a manner concerning the letters, as shows strongly their consciousness of their own falsehoods. They do not come forward with them, in a bold exultation of spirits, natural to so fortunate an incident. They have no boldness. They have no exultation. So different are the cold mimickries of art, from the warm realities of nature! They say barely, that they have "recovered" some of her letters; that they shall build upon them a charge of murder against her; and that they intend to do this *at some future and indeterminate time, and in case* she does not comply with some requisitions of theirs. Such is the creeping and sneaking pace, with which villainy often attempts, and betrays, its own purposes of imposition!

In consequence of both, the letters, thus said to be in the possession of the rebels, were never shown to the English embassadour, to their own council of lords on the 23d, or to a single person at the time. They were not dwelt upon, in the council. They were not mentioned, in the message from it to Mary. They were even not so

much as hinted at, by that Lord Lindsay, who came from the Queen to be present at the council, and who carried back the message to the Queen from it. That they were not spoken of in the one, and not noticed in the other, is plain from Throgmorton's account of both before. That they were not, even remotely, hinted at to Mary by Lord Lindsay, amidst all his blustering and brutish addressees to her; is equally plain from an account, which I shall soon give from Mary herself. And the whole was left to be insinuated privately, to be suggested covertly, to be spoken of with all the vagueness of something merely contingent and ideal, and so to skulk with the timidity of guilt at first, in holes and corners.

By all this, the rebels meant merely to frighten Mary into a resignation of her crown. They meant it, by all their proceedings towards her. They therefore suggested hints to "the mob of gentlemen who *think* with ease," concerning her adultery with Bothwell, and her murder of the King. Finding that these believed in the nonsense; the vulgar, to whom they were connected below, received it for sound sense; and the nobles, with whom they were united above, adopted it for useful policy. They founded upon it their publick message, demanding a resignation from her. They raised upon it their private declarations, of intending to use violence and force if she would not resign. They built upon it also, their secret insinuations to the English embassadour, of their design to produce *some* letters of Mary's,

Mary's, which they had *somewhere* procured; and to prove murder against her, from them. And all were made to operate upon Mary, just as they wished. They were all designed merely, to give the embassadour and others a colour, for pretending to be frightened on her Majesty's account, and so pressing her Majesty to do, *what the rebels wanted her to do*.

Accordingly we find, that the embassadour and others wrote to the Queen, as under the terrours of fear for her safety; and with earnest urgency upon her, to secure her safety by compliance. Throgmorton wrote to her, advising her by all means to sign the paper of resignation, in apprehension of the consequences. Even some of *the rebel lords*, men who were *chiefs in all their counsels and actions*, sent to her at the same time; pretending to be her friends, and impelling her into the same measure. These were Athol, Mar, Tullibardin, Lethington, and Grange. And, what shows the fraud completely, they sent their message to her by the same retainer of rebellion, the same shuffling and self-accommodating knave, who carried the letter of Throgmorton to her. "The Erle of Athol," says Mary herself by her commissioners afterwards, "Lardis of Tullibardin and Lethington, being principallis of their counfall;" and, as the loyal lords of Scotland add in their instructions to these commissioners, "utheris, partakeris in that cause*;" or as one of the commissioners, the bishop of Ross, speaks

* Goodall, ii. 362.

in his own defence of Queen Mary's honour, "with other principals of their factious band *;" sent to Mary. These others appear from James Melvill, to have been Mar and Grange †. All united "sent Robert Melvile to her Hienes, "with one ring and tokenis," which one of them had interchanged with her before, under pretence of sending her messages. This was Lethington assuredly; the very man, no doubt, who had reported the resolution of their council, the message, the designs, and the letters to Throgmorton; and had suggested equally to him, the idea of his writing to Mary. Their message was "counselling her Majestie to subscriue sic writingis, as "would be presented to her Grace for dimission "of her crown, for to put off that present deith, "quhilk was preparit for her Hienes, gif she refused the same; assuring her, quhatsumever her "Majestie did in captivitie, mycht nocht prejudice her Hienes in na sort. And also the said "Robert Melwile brocht at the same time, ane "writing fra Sir Nicolace Throgmortone, writtin "with his awin hand, desyring her Hienes to "subscriue quatever they woulde require her "unto; for the estate, quhairin her Grace was "then, coulde not prejudice her, quatever her "Majestie subscribed ‡."

Nor let it be thought uncandid in me, to be the first who has ever suspected Athol, Mar, Tul-

* Lesley, 37.

† P. 85.

‡ Goodall, ii. 166. And see Ruddiman's Buchanan, ii. Chameleon, 15, for Lethington's intercourse with Mary in prison.

libardin, Lethington, and Grange, of acting in this perfidious manner to Mary. I wish to be candid. But I must also be just. The number of rebel lords, who thus united to address her in privacy, is too great for the amount of the whole. The advice was too pernicious likewise, to be ever given by any real friends of Mary's. It was the very advice, which her enemies would instigate all her treacherous friends to give her. And, what is a full evidence that these were only *such* friends to her, they were one and all before, one and all afterwards, leaders and directors under the usurpation. Lethington, Grange, and Athol*, indeed, are known to have declared for Mary afterwards. But they declared not for years. Tullibardin also deserted the rebels, so early as the spring of 1568. But he deserted them, only "upon some private discontents" against Murray. He therefore returned to them, on the death of Murray†. Nor did he ever unite himself to the adherents of Mary, in the interval. And Mar continued with the rebels to the last, and closed his life in the service of the usurpation.

But, if this had not been the case, we may ask with great propriety and energy concerning all;

Had they not seen PHARSALIA?

Had they not all pledged their honours to Mary,

* Crawford, 158.

† Keith, 469, Buchanan Hist. xix. 368, Spotswood, 215, and Crawford, 150.

by the mouths of Grange and Morton, at the hill of Carbarrie and on the 15th of June, in the presence of both the armies; to obey her with as much fidelity, as had ever been shown to any of her ancestors, by any of the nobility of Scotland? Yet had they not seen her instantly, almost before the sound of Grange's words had gone off from her ears, and the breath of Morton's lips had mingled with the common air, seized by the vile hands of their associates, compelled to mount on horseback, and hurried away under a guard of soldiers to a prison? Did not even Athol and Mar, as well as all the others, actually sign the execrable order for this*? Did they not both also, at the coronation of the prince, formally accept that very resignation as free and valid, which they had assured her could not be valid, because it was not free†? And did they not all continue to act with one another, and with the other brothers of their fanatical fellowship, under the whole? They did. Such persons, therefore, could be actuated by no principles of friendship for Mary, in the advice which they gave her. They could be impelled only by the same spirit, which continued to impel them afterwards. They were serving that cause of usurpation, to which they had been so obstinately attached. They were serving it with no greater perfidiousness to Mary then, than what they had shown to

* Anderson, ii. 225, mentions Morton, Athol, Mar, Glencarne, Ruthven, Hume, Lindsay, Semple, and "diveres "utheris" barons and gentlemen. And Crawford's Memoirs say, that "*all* the associators signed" it, p. 40.

† Keith, 408.

her already. And they all showed the grossness of their perfidy to every eye, in advising her to sign the demanded resignation, because she was in prison; and because this, and the superadded threats of violence, would render all that she did under both unavailable against her: when on her escaping from the prison, and revoking the resignation, not one of them all joined her; and Mar, Lethington, and Grange, actually appeared in arms against her*.

Nor can Throgmorton be acquitted any more than they, from endeavouring to give a form of law to their usurpation, by imposing upon the honest credulity of Mary. It is indeed an act of baseness so flagrant, to abuse the confidence of unsuspecting generosity, under the pretence of friendship, and to these vast purposes of villainy; as asks no common portion of meanness, to be guilty of it. But we have seen Throgmorton already, to be too well tutored in the school of the world, not to be capable of it. He came into Scotland, ready to side with the rebels, because they were in power; and ready to take part against the Queen, because she was slandered. He continued afterwards, receiving implicitly the calumnies that they reported of Mary; when these calumnies carried their own refutation with them, and were overthrown directly by Mary's own letter to him. And, what confirms all, though he wrote such a letter of advice to Mary, he never dared to mention it to Elizabeth. He

* Keith, 478 and 480.

must have written it late on the 23d, the day on which the council was held, or early on the 24th, the day on which his letter reached Mary. But we have one whole letter written by him on the 23d, and a very large part of another on the 24th. Yet he does not give the least hint, of his having so written to the Queen; in either or in any other. He knew Elizabeth, to be more attached to Mary yet than to the rebels; because she was not fully convinced yet, that Mary could not serve her purposes as well as they. He shows his knowledge of this point, so late as the very 23d; when, in his letter to the Earl of Leicester, he speaks thus. “It is easy to be seen,” he says, “that the power and ability to do any thing, to the commodity of the Queen’s Majesty and the realm of Scotland; will chiefly, and in manner wholly, rest in the hands of these lords, and others their associates, assembled at Edinburgh: now if the Queen’s Majesty *will still persist*, in her former opinion towards the Queen of Scotland (unto whom she shall be able to do no good); then I do plainly see, that these lords, and all their accomplices, will become as good French, as the French King can wish, to all intents and purposes*.” A genuine statesman has but one set of ideas. Publick expediency swallows up all other considerations. In this kind of civil madness, was Throgmorton, we see, to the very day of writing to Mary. Yet he saw Elizabeth, whose ideas were as few

* Robertson, ii. 378.

and as discoloured as his own, not sufficiently assured hitherto of Mary's inability to minister to her schemes, and so leaning to Mary still. And he therefore presumed not to tell Elizabeth, what he had done in concert with the rebels, by advising Mary*.

He wrote to advise her. She wrote back to tell him she would follow his advice, and to beg he would acquaint Elizabeth with the whole. "Her Grace sent answer in writ," say her commissioners, "that her Hienes would use his counsel; and prayit him to declair unto hir derrest sister, the Quenis Majestie of England his mastres, how hir Hienes was handilit be hir

* Mary plainly saw into this trick of Throgmorton's afterwards; as appears from a letter of hers to Elizabeth in 1582, Appendix, No. xvii. But Throgmorton had even played the same trick of dishonesty upon Mary before, though not with the same success. When Murray and his rebels in 1565, were driven into England; Throgmorton wrote to Mary, to prevent their attainders. He wrote evidently in concert with Murray, to save him and his from utter ruin. Yet he wrote so artfully, that Keith has produced his letter as a proof of his "generosity." See it in Melvill, 60—63, and Keith, 322—324. And with a weakness of credulity, that is the natural result of probity in the world, he has hitherto been thought by all, to have acted in both these deeds of baseness, with sincerity and fairness. The general concurrence of Throgmorton with Murray and the men banished with him, is betrayed very clearly by a letter, which Morton and Ruthven wrote to him; when they were obliged, for the murder of Rizzio, to flee into England. In this they confidentially tell him all their secrets. And "*we doubt not to find your favour,*" they say, "*as our brethren have done of before, who were of late banished*" (Goodall, i. 265).

"subjectis,

“ subjectis, and quhat estaite her Grace was in
 “ for the tyme; and to declair also, that the
 “ subscryving of that dimissiou was against her
 “ will; and *doubtis nocht*, bot the said Sir Nico-
 “ lace schewit the samyn unto the Quenis Majes-
 “ tie of this realme, *her Hienes being myndit at that*
 “ *tyme, to haif send an armie in Scotland for the*
 “ *delyvering of her Majestie furth of presoun*, war
 “ not [were it not that] *her Majestie was suirlye*
 “ *advertisit, in case her Hienes had so done, the blude*
 “ *of our mastres had payt the sould [wages] of her*
 “ *Hienes souldiouris* *.” We here see a couple of
 bold falsehoods, that had been imposed by Throg-
 morton upon Mary, before he advised her to the
 ruinous measure of a resignation. He had per-
 suaded her of Elizabeth’s intention, to send an
 army into Scotland for her release; which we
 know from a full view of his and Elizabeth’s dis-
 patches, to be absolutely false. He had afterwards
 persuaded her, as it was never intended to be
 done, that it could not be because of the danger
 to her life from it; the rebels, he said, having
 threatened to put Mary to death, as soon as the
 army entered Scotland; a threat, that we equally
 know from the same correspondence, to have been
 never uttered to Throgmorton at the time, and
 never reported at the time to Elizabeth †. These
 false topicks of application to Mary, he suppresses

* Goodall, ii. 166—167.

† Such a threat, but not *this*, was afterwards made, and
 not till the end of September following; if even then, as I sus-
 pect *this* to be a trick of Elizabeth’s own invention. See Ca-
 bala, 1st part, 130, and Keith, 463.

in his dispatches, equally with his false advice to her. He acted in all, no doubt, under the influence of the rebels, and particularly of Lethington. And his silence concerning all, shows that he was equally false in all *.

It

* Let me here add another instance, of Throgmorton's *prevarications* in this embassy; which he equally suppressed in his letters to Elizabeth. On July 21st, he wrote to know Elizabeth's pleasure, if he should be asked to attend at the proposed coronation of the young prince (Keith, Pref, xii). This letter she answered on the 27th. "We think," she says, "that knowing our mind in all this action as you do, that you will not by any such act affirm their doings;" and she expressly forbids him, "to assent thereto by any means" (Keith, 430). Yet after he had written for instructions, and before he received them, on the 29th, he "affirmed their doings;" not indeed by his own presence, but by the presence of one of his train, *his own cousin*, and *the principal person under him*. In his previous embassy, the 21st of May, 1565, he says: "I arrived in the morning at Stirling, and descended from my horse at the castle-gate; *having sent before my cousin Middlemore, your Majesty's servant, to demand my audience*" (Keith, 276). See also Forbes, ii. 99, 108, 111, and 113, for his "cousin Middlemore." And in his present embassy, says the rebel journal, "July 24, the Quene maid resignation of hir crowne in favour of hir sone——; at this tyme Sir Nycholas Throgmorton was in Scotland: 29. the King was crownit at Stirling; MIDDILMOIR WAS PRESENT" (Appendix, No. x). He had written to ask, if he should be present himself. He knew her mind to be averse to it. Yet he sent his representative to attend for him, in order, as much as he dared, "to affirm their doings." And, what was perhaps still more, *he went actually to Stirling himself*, at the coronation. "He was in town," says Spotswood, 211, though "he refused his presence to that solemnity." He came as near to the forbidden ground, as ever he dared. He stood hovering at the
very

It seems very extraordinary, that they who had the courage to arrest the person of their Queen, to force her to Lochlevin, and shut her up in a prison there; who had the boldness to seize all the jewels, all the patrimony, and all the power of the crown; and who had thus taken complete possession, of the whole wealth and authority of Mary; should yet condescend to the humility of asking her in any manner to resign a crown, of which she had been deprived by them. It proves strongly the predominancy of right over violence, and of royalty over usurpation, on the minds of the most violent usurpers. But it is perhaps more extraordinary, that the very few persons, who constituted the council of the rebels at this period, should have had the presumption to do all this. Throgmorton has given us an account of them, which is curious. They admitted him to an audience at last. But it was not till the 24th; till they had actually sent off Lord Lindsay in the morning, to insist upon a resignation from the Queen. This however gave him an opportunity of seeing all the members of the council the day before, except Lindsay, collected together again. There were present, he says, “these lords whose names I send your Majesty “in a schedule.” The schedule runs thus: “Barons of the parliament, the Earl of Athol, “Earl of Morton, Earl of Glencairn, Earl of “Marre; Master of Montrose, called Lord

very line and barrier of it. And he boldly sent his cousin and his deputy, to cross the line, to bound over the barrier, and to enter the *Pandæmonium* itself.

“Grahame,

“Grahame, heir to the Earl of Montrose; Lord
 “Hume, Lord Ruthven, Lord Creighton of
 “Sanquhair, Lord Sempill, Lord Enermeith,
 “Kord Ochiltree; L. Craigmillar, Provost of
 “Edinburgh; the Commendator of Driburgh,
 “the Commendator of Cambuskenneth, Mr.
 “James Macgill.” These, says Throgmorton,
 “were set about a long table;” and with them
 appears to have been Lethington also. There
 were also, he adds, “round about them a great
 “number of barons and gentlemen (whose names
 “I do omit to make mention of) to the number
 “forty, bestowed upon seats*.” They were
 therefore FOUR earls; ONE heir to an earl; SEVEN
 barons with Lindsay: the Provost of Edin-
 borough; two commendators or secular abbots;
 the secretary of state; the clerk of the council;
 and FORTY of the petty barons and gentry, men
 not barons of parliament, men inferiour even to
 the Provost of Edinburgh, and therefore placed
 on seats behind. Accordingly Mary says concern-
 ing the coronation of her son afterwards, when the
 same men nearly, we may be sure, attended upon
 the occasion: that “quhair in that realme [Scot-
 “land] thair is MA [more] ERLIS, BISCHOPIS,
 “AND LORDIS, HAIFING VOICE IN PARLIA-
 “MENT, NOR AN HUNDRETH [than a hundred];
 “of the quhilk the haill, or at the leist the greytest
 “part, should haif consentit thairto, and to all
 “uthir publick actiounis of consequence; [there]
 “WER ONLIE FOUR ERLIS, quhairof the most

* Keith, 426 and 427, and Pref. xi.

“honorabill

“ honorabill hes nocht the sevint or eight place
“ in parliament amangis the Erlis, nor the first
“ of twenty voitis amangis the haill estatis,” the
peers of Scotland then voting according to their
personal precedence; “SEX LORDIS ONLIE, quha
“ wer all at hir Grace’s taking; together with
“ ANE Bischope, and TWA or THRE Abbotis and
“ Prioris; quhilk could be na sufficient number,
“ to determine and conclude sa weightie an
“ caus*.” They certainly could not. THIRTEEN
out of MORE THAN A HUNDRED, could only be
an EIGHTH part of the whole. If such a petty
proportion could constitute themselves, the repre-
sentatives of all the rest; could, by the aid of men
not members of parliament, assume to themselves
an authority, which all the nobility and all the
gentry together had never possessed, and to rise
paramount to the royalty itself; then a club of
drunken porters in a night-cellar at present, may
vote themselves into a house of commons, chuse
a speaker, set him in a chair, place a *bauble* for
a *mace* upon a table before him, and form taxes
for the whole nation.

These men however, few as they were, had
firm nerves and strong spirits. They relied on
the prevailing spirit of folly, among the clergy
and the people. On this they grounded their
main hopes of success. And, even if they should
not succeed, they were sure of finding mercy in
the bosom of Mary. She who had so easily
pardoned Morton, Glencairn, and Lethington,

* Goodall, ii. 167—168.

for the murder of Rizzio; and forgiven to Murray and to Grange, their rebellion against her; would in a little time have been calmed down, by the excess of her good-nature, into forgiveness and pardon again. They had therefore much to hope, and little to fear. *This* strung their nerves, and *this* supported their spirits. This particularly emboldened them, to urge Mary for a resignation, by every publick and every private sollicitation in their power; by every delicacy of regard for her threatened honour, every anxiety of fear for her endangered life, and every treacherous persuasion concerning the unbinding nature of her compliance, under such threats, with such dangers, and in the confinement of a prison. They should thus retain all the authority which they had seized, in the name of her infant son. And they should throw a thin veil of law, over the scandalousness of their present usurpations.

Their embassadour, Lindsay, set out on this business upon the 24th of July. It was ordered by the council, that he should that day, “*accompanied with Robert Melvil*, repair to the Queen.” Accordingly, as Throgmorton adds, “the Lord Lindsay departed this morning from this town to Lochlevin, *accompanied with Robert Melvil**.” But though they were to go

* Keith, 424 and 425.—Having spoken already, and now coming to speak again, with some severity against Sir Robert Melvill, for his double conduct; let me here record a fact against him, that will press strongly upon the feelings of all my readers. Mary informs us of it, in her letter from Lochlevin to Elizabeth, May the 1st, 1568. In this she

go together, and though they actually set out together; yet the plan of fraud which was to be executed by Melvill, and the system of violence which was to be pursued by Lindsay, required that they should part before they reached Lochlevin, and each make a separate entry upon the stage. The fraud was to be tried first. The violence was kept for the reserve. Melvill therefore, who carried the dispatches from Throgmorton and the pretended friends of Mary; who was apparently sent by the council that he might carry them, as he has no *publick* concern in the whole business; and who appears to have had such a pliancy of knavery, with such a speciousness of honesty, about him, as made him a very proper tool for this act of perfidious villainy; passed the lake, and came to Mary. And in the mean time Lindsay, who carried the verbal demand of the council to her, and the instruments of resignation for her signature, waited at a house upon the opposite bank of the lake †. Melvill produced the ring, and other tokens,

she thus writes: “Robert Melvin—says, that he DARES NOT
“RESTORE THAT RING TO ME,” the ring sent to her by Elizabeth, “though I gave it him *secretly*, as *the most pretious jewel which I had*.” “Robert Melvin—dit, ne me l’oser
“randre, combien que la lui avoys baylée segretement,
“comme mon plus cher jouau” (Haynes, 464). He had secretly received from the Queen a fine jewel presented to her by Elizabeth, that he might confidentially preserve it for her. She afterwards required it from him again, when (no doubt) she was meditating that escape, which she effected the very day after she wrote this letter. And he then refused to return it, under the pretended fear of offending the rebels. Such a dishonourable wretch was he!

† Melvill, 85, and Lesley’s Defence, 37.

which

which he had received; and delivered his message. He then produced Throgmorton's letter. But this he had politically hid in the sheath of his sword*, under the pretence of concealing it from those, who were sure *not* to search a man, that came commissioned from the council itself. Every circumstance is thus awry, in the transaction. The fear pretended, the parting made, the sending Melvill with Lindsay, the message which he bore from some of the rebels, and the dispatch which he carried from Throgmorton, are all only so many steps, in one regular course of imposture. Yet all was ineffectual. The strong mind of Mary was not to be warped by such solicitations, however disguised, and however urgent. And she peremptorily refused, to think of signing the papers †.

Then Lord Lindsay came forward. To give the greater formidableness to his presence, his coming was announced beforehand. He was at the new house on the other side, just ready to take boat and cross over. And he was threatening much what he would do ‡. So well were the two parts of the drama kept up! This man is said to have been passionate, even to madness ||. Yet he appears not, in the intervals of his lunacy, to have possessed one spark of that good-nature, which usually distinguishes the passionate. He was as stern as he was wrathful, and as steady as

* Lesley's Negotiations, 19—20, Anderson, 111.

† Melvill, 85.

‡ Ibid.

|| Jebb, ii. 221. See also Crawford, 302, for his "furious" and "violent humour;" and also 274.

he was quick in his fury. Such a man might well give an alarm, to the apprehensions of a lady and a Queen. She began to shrink in her resolutions, at the intelligence of his approach*. The applications before, however expressive of the violences intended by her enemies, yet being made by pretended friends to her, had not roused her fears so strongly, as to overpower her judgment. She saw clearly what she ought to do. And she determined firmly to do so. But now the very violence itself approached. Lindsay entered. He carried in his hand “three instruments to be signed by the Queen; the one containing her consent to have her son crowned, and to relinquish the government of the realm; the other a commission of regency of the realm, to be granted to the Earl of MURRAY, during the King’s minority; the third a like commission, to be granted to certain of the nobility and others, for the governance of the realm during the King’s minority, in case the Earl of Murray will not accept the regency alone †.” He demanded her immediate subscription to them. He was authorized privately by the council, “to denounce punishment and death unto her, for the murder of her lawful husband King Henry,” if she refused to subscribe ‡. A man so insolent and so imperious, as he was by habit, would be sure to behave with a double portion of imperiousness and of insolence, to a fallen Queen. She had pardoned that very lord, for his share in the murder of Rizzio, and the imprisonment of her

* Melvill, 85.

† Keith, 425.

‡ Ibid. 425.

person,

person, before *. But all generosity was lost upon his sullen spirit. He was probably the more insolent, because she had had the power, and the more imperious, because she had had the generosity to forgive. "He mineffit her Grace," say Mary's commissioners upon her own authority, "that, gif she wald nocht subscriyve, he had comand to put her presentlie IN THE TOWRE," the usual dungeon, no doubt, for common offenders, "and WALD DO THE SAME; and counsalit hir fulfill thair desyre, or ellis WAR," worse than being thrust into the dungeon, even death, "would SCHORTLIE FOLLOW" her being there †." Lindsay, says the bishop of Ross, "MOST GREVOUSLY, with FEAREFUL WORDES, "and VERY CRUEL AND STERNE COUNTENANCE, "thretned her; that, unlesse she would therto "subscribe, SHE SHOULD LOSE HER LIFE ‡." And then "hir Hienes subscriyvit WITH MONY "TEARIS, never luiking what was contenit in "the writings; and "declaring plainly thaireftir," as soon as she had subscribed, "gif "ever hir Grace come to liberti, [she] wolde "never abyde thairat, becaus it was against her "Majestie's will ||."

With

* Lesley's Defence, 58.

† Goodall, ii. 167.

‡ Lesley's Defence, 37—38.

|| Goodall, ii. 167. "They threatened her with no less than death, if she complied not;" and at last "she signed whatever papers they presented to her, without so much as reading one of them; and indeed *her tears would hardly have permitted her that benefit, if she had desired it.*" Crawford, 45. "Lough-leven," says M. Pennant, "a magnificent piece of water, very broad, but irregularly indented, is about twelve miles in circumference, and its greatest depth

With this “abhorred mixture of cunning and
 “ferocity *,” did the rebels assail their imprisoned
 Queen. The cunning was baffled, but the fe-
 rocity prevailed. Lord Lindsay instantly posted
 back, to his associates at Edinburgh. Only
 five of them, however, were now in town. These
 met instantly. They were Morton, Athol,
 Hume, Sanquhar, and Ruthven. They met on
 July the 25th, the very day after the resignation
 was so signed. They “glaidlie aggreit thairto,
 “allowit, and apprevit the samyn †.” An order
 was made, for the prince to be crowned on the
 29th. The rebels crowned him, accordingly.
 They gave MURRAY the regency, on the 22d of
 August ‡. And they thus threw a thin veil
 of law at last, over the scandalousness of their

“about twenty-four fathoms.—Some islands are dispersed in
 “this great expanse of water; one of which is large enough
 “to feed several head of cattle; but the most remarkable is
 “that distinguished by the captivity of Mary Stuart, which
 “stands almost in the middle of the lake. The castle still
 “remains, consists of a *square tower*, a small yard with two
 “round towers, a chapel, and the ruins of a building,
 “where (it is said) the unfortunate princess was lodged. In
 “the *square tower* is a DUNGEON, with a vaulted room above,
 “over which had been three other stories” (Four in Scot-
 land, 1769, i. 64). These and the other travels of Mr.
 Pennant, as far as I have read them, are lively, agreeable,
 and instructing. Only the reader is disgusted perpetually
 with that *tradesman’s token* in them, the studious omission of
 the nominative case, in order to avoid the imputation of
 egotism. And the authour is the mere mirror of popular
 opinions in history.

* “The villain spider lives, cunning and fierce,

“Mixture abhorred!

Thompson.

† Keith, 434.

‡ Appendix, No. x.

usurpation.

usurpation. But it was a veil of black cyprus only. It was too transparent to hide any thing. All their scandalousness was seen through it. And their usurpation was shown and set off at once, by the blackness of it.

Though the rebels had now gained the grand object, at which they aimed; yet the manner, in which it was gained, continually embarrassed their conduct afterwards. The cession pretended to be a voluntary one. Yet it was an outrageous deed of violence. What ground then shall they take, in their publick memorials concerning it? Shall they assert the voluntariness of the resignation? Or shall they boldly fix their possession of power, upon the footing of force? To do *that*, would be an enormity of impudence indeed. But to do *this*, would be to render the resignation itself useless. They therefore do not know, which line of conduct to take. They take neither decisively. They walk sometimes upon one stile, and sometimes upon the other. This is a very striking fact, in the proceedings of the rebels. And it is another instance, of the shifting and dodging, so natural to conscious villainy. In a parliament which they held the December following, they had Mary's "FRE ASSENT," say the nobles of Mary's party; "AFFIRMIT be *sindrie* "there present, with MONY SOLEMNIT AITHIS "be sum lordis," Lord Lindsay one of them, no doubt, "and INSTRUMENTIS OF NOTARIS DECLARING THE SAMIN *." Such was the bold and perjurious impudence, of the rebel lords. Yet

* Goodall, ii. 363.

with the natural inconsistency of guilt, to the contradiction of their own notarial instruments, and to the confusion of their own perjurious witnesses, in the very same parliament they passed a law; which says all done to the Queen “unto the day
 “and dait of this present act, and in all tymes to
 “cuim, tuiching the said Quene and deten-
 “ing of her person,—WES IN THE SAID QUENIS
 “AWIN DEFAULT; in sa far as—scho was previe,
 “airt and pairt, of the actual devise and deid
 “of the—murthour of the King*.”

Thus was Mary, in one and the same parliament, expressly averred by many solemn oaths of lords, and by the formal attestations of publick notaries, to have freely ceded her crown to her son; and yet asserted by a law, to have had it rightfully taken from her, because she was accessory to the murder of her husband. But the former was affirmed, only by notaries and lords. The latter was recorded in form, upon the statutes of the kingdom. So much better did the rebels like their possession by force, than their right by consent! Yet in the answer, which they afterwards put in at York to Mary's accusation of them, they amazingly blended both together. Bothwell, they said, murdered the King, seized the Queen, and married her. They took up arms, to rescue her person and dissolve her marriage. They did the one. She would not let them do the other. They could have no answer from her, “bot rigorus minassing, on the ane
 “part avowand to be revengit on all thame

* Appendix, No. ii.

“ that had schawin thamefelfis in that cause,”
 that is, to be revenged on those who had *rescued*
 her; “ and on the uther part offerand to leif,
 “ and gif over, the realme and all, sua scho nicht
 “ be sufferit to posses the murtherer of hir hus-
 “ band,” the very man who had *seized* her per-
 son, who had *forced* her into a marriage, and
 was likely to have *murdered* her in a short time,
 according to the accounts of the rebels themselves
 before: “ quhilk hir inflexible mynd—compellit
 “ thame to sequesterate hir persoun for a feason,”
 as imprisonment is the best cure for love: “ dur-
 “ ing the quhilk tyme, sco finding himself, be
 “ lang, irksom, and tedious travail takin be hir
 “ in the governament of the realme,—sa vexit
 “ and weryit; that hir body, sprite, and senses
 “ wer altogidder unable langer to occupy that
 “ realme,” though she was just now *menacing* them
rigorously;—“ thairfoir dimittit and renuncit the
 “ office,—in favouris of hir—sone*.” Of these
 impudent falsehoods we may say, as Prince Henry
 does of Falstaff’s, but with some little variation
 of words, and with a much higher reach of mean-
 ing; “ these lies are like THE FATHER THAT BE-
 “ GOT THEM, gross as a mountain, open, pal-
 “ pable.” They are such a jumble of force and
 freedom, such an union of contradictory asser-
 tions, as perhaps was never exhibited to the
 world, by any set of usurpers, before.

Yet all is equalled in the accusation against
 Mary, presented by these very men at West-
 minster afterwards. Charging her with the mur-

* Goodall, ii. 145—146.

der of her husband, they say, “the estat of the
 “realme of Scotland, FINDING HIR UNWORTHIE
 “TO REGNE, decernit hir DIMISSION of the
 “CROWN—TO BE LAUCHFULLIE—DONE*.” It
 seems to be the peculiar curse of usurpations, to
 think with a wild confusion of ideas, and to speak
 with a wild contradictoriness of language, concern-
 ing their own transactions. The fact is, that the
 wickedest men can hardly ever rise to such an
 altitude of wickedness at once, as to become
 perfectly clear and consistent, in their pretences
 for it. And even after all, after they had so-
 lemnly assured Elizabeth’s commissioners under
 their own hand, that their parliament had pro-
 nounced Mary “unworthy to reign,” and had
 “decreed her dismissal of the crown to be law-
 “fully done;” they actually put Elizabeth upon
 treating with Mary, *as still in possession of the
 crown, and on inducing her to resign it again, in
 the very terms of her former resignation.*

This desire of a second resignation, was the
 natural consequence of their confusion and con-
 tradictoriness, under the first. It was merely a
 recurrence to that original plan, which had failed.
 It was still to frighten. But it was to frighten
 by intimated approaches of danger, and not by
 the immediate presence of it. It was therefore
 to give a semblance of voluntariness to the re-
 signation, though there was no reality in it. And
 it would be of great consequence to them, to sub-
 stitute such a resignation in the place of the pre-

* Goodall, ii. 207.

sent, which had neither reality nor semblance in it. It was with this view only, that the letters were first thought of. The idea of them was thrown out at first, entirely with this view. And, with this view only, was the idea reduced into writing afterwards. This is plain from the tenour and spirit of Elizabeth's conduct, concerning them. She made Murray produce them before her commissioners, on the 8th of December, 1568. *She* urged him to the act, to gratify her own mean mind by the slanders thrown in them upon Mary. But *he* consented to it, in order to push his plan into execution, by terrifying Mary into a second, and seemingly unforced, resignation. Then Elizabeth, gratified in her own purposes, was earnest to indulge him in his. Her secretary therefore, so early as the 22d of December afterwards, went to work for him. Cecil drew up a detail upon paper, of what was proper to be done at the present emergency. The *first* point that occurred to his mind, was—the resignation of Mary. “What is meetest,” he asks. And he answers himself thus: “First, that the Queen of Scots be *induced* to yield herself to remain in “the realme” of England, “and not depart; “and that *the estate of her son and the regent, may “remain and continue**.” That very day, Elizabeth wrote herself to Sir Francis Knollys, one of Mary's keepers, to instruct him; “that in conclusion it is thought, of all uther devisees, *this “to be the best for us.*” So thoroughly did she

* Goodall, ii. 274.

consider Murray's cause, to be her own! She then proposes the scheme, as Cecil had delineated it. "And the cause of this hir yelding and assent," she adds, is "to be grounded and notified to"
"procede of hir owne good-wil, by reson of hir"
"weryness of governance, and of desyre to see"
"hir sonne stablised; in such termes, *to save*"
"*hir honor*, as is at more length conteaned, in"
"THE INSTRUMENT DEVISED FOR THE DIMIS-"
"SION OF HIR CROWN, WHYLEST SHE WAS IN"
"LOUGHLEVIN*." So completely did the parts of Elizabeth's system, now unite into one with Murray's! But Mary was not to be warped in her judgment, or affected in her spirit, by these applications of Elizabeth's to her; any more than she had been, by the sollicitations of Throgmorton, and five of her rebel chiefs, before. They were both fraudulent and perfidious. And she returned that high-toned answer to the last, which we have recorded before to her honour.

Yet the overture was of too great consequence to Murray, to be given up for such a majestick rejection of it as that. Cecil therefore took up his projecting pen again, on the 7th of January. He formed another scheme upon paper. But it was still the same. His mind, at this period, entirely moved upon the pivot of resignation. And his present project is conceived, half of it in the same manner as his former, and half in a new way. The plan is thus described by himself:
"That she may require licence to remain in this

* Goodall, ii. 278—279.

"realm,

“ realm, free from the troubles of government of
 “ her realm, and that her son may remain King,
 “ —and the government to be in the Earl of
 “ Murray;” or else, “ That if the Queen will
 “ remain Queen both in name and possession,
 “ —yet—she may have her son also remain
 “ King, and be joined with her in all respectis,
 “ and that the government may remain, untill
 “ the King shall come to 18 years, in the Earl
 “ of Murray *.” Elizabeth was ready to concur
 in any measures of accommodation, that would
 be as effectual as a voluntary resignation in itself,
 by fixing the sceptre in the hands of Murray.
 And she solemnly proposed the former half of
 the overture to Mary’s commissioners, that very
 day. “ It semit,” she said, “ maist meit and
 “ convenient, that scho,” Mary, “ as being
 “ wearie of the realme and government thair of,
 “ sould zeild [yield] up the crown and govern-
 “ ment thair of, and demit the same in favouris
 “ of hir sone the prince †.” But the instant
 reply of the commissioners to this proposal, their
 peremptory rejection of it in the name of their
 mistress, their unanimous and absolute refusal
 even to transmit it to her, and their determinate
 perseverance in all; for ever put an end to the
 project, and even prevented the offer of the alter-
 native designed.

The hope of a second and seemingly voluntary
 resignation, then, appears to have been the ac-
 tuating motive to Murray, and through him to

* Goodall, ii. 295.

† Ibid. 300.

Elizabeth at last ; in forming the charge of murder against Mary, in forging letters that should pretend to prove it, and in producing them as he did produce them. Elizabeth had no other view, at last. And he had scarcely any other, from the beginning to the end of his proceedings ; from his first production of them before the council and parliament of Scotland in December, 1567, to his last before the English commissioners at Westminster in December, 1568.

Buchanan has long had the super-eminent infamy among the friends of Mary, of having forged the letters from her to Bothwell. It was not given to him very early *. Yet it has been continued to him very steadily. But I am compelled by the force of evidence, to clear Buchanan of this villainy, and to lay it upon another.

The first time, that the idea of a set of forged letters was suggested to the rebels, was on the 24th of July, 1567. It was pretty certainly a spark, struck off from the mind of LETHINGTON, by the friendly collision of the ideas of adultery and murder, then floating among the mob of clergy and gentry in Edinburgh, and his own habits of forging the hand-writing of Mary. These habits are sufficiently attested by *his own confession* ; as he acknowledged in secret to the commissioners at York, that he had frequently

* The forgery was originally attributed to Mary Bethune or Beaton, one of Mary's maids of honour. Jebb, i. 524, and ii. 243.

forged her writing *. His active hand, therefore, caught the spark as it flew; threw in the combustibles, which his active genius could always furnish; and fanned both immediately, into a little flame. He is expressly said by the rebels themselves, to have been “esteemed” by them, as “one of the best engines or spirits of his country †.” He is particularly reported, to have had “a crafty head and fell [or sharp] tongue ‡.” Elizabeth also is declared by her own embassador, to have known him well, “for his wisdom “to conceive, and his wit to convey, whatsoever “his mind is bent unto to bring it to pass §.” And he is described by another cotemporary, to have been “naturally enclined to plotting and “intriguing; and fond of encountering difficulties, as tools that served to sharpen his wit, of “which he had a very great stock ||.” He instantly conceived the plan of a series of letters, fabricated in a writing similar to Mary’s, and proving all that the mob asserted; in order to terrify Mary into the wanted resignation. He instantly connected it, with its proper accompaniments. His mind had always a quickness of invention, and a vigour of formation, about it. And his tongue, which was as lively as his fancy, instantly reported the whole, for a system already

* Camden, Translation, 116, Original, i. 143—144, and Crawford, 105—106, 114.

† In Paris’s first Confession, Goodall, i. 140.

‡ Keith, 205.

§ Ibid. 262.

|| Crawford, 107. So Spotswood says of him, that he “could put on any disguise on his nature,” 189.

in existence, to Throgmorton ; to whose lodgings he frequently repaired, and in whose ear he frequently whispered, or pretended to whisper, the secret designs of the party. He was, no doubt, the principal channel of intelligence to Throgmorton on all occasions. He was the only channel upon this. Had the project of the letters been known to any, except the relater and the reporter ; it must soon have crept out among the busy partizans in the city, and appeared in some of Throgmorton's intelligences concerning them. Such a pretended discovery, if it had once gone out beyond the two, would not long have crept. It would quickly have raised itself upon its feet. It would have stalked forth in gigantick formidableness, among the amazed crowds. And it was privately intimated to Throgmorton only, that he might act in conjunction with Lethington, and his four associates in treachery ; that he might write like them to Mary, upon the dangers that were pressing upon her from every side ; and so might unite to drive the poor doe, which they could not *hunt* down, into the *toils* prepared for her.

In this manner, I believe, was the first intimation of the letters thrown out to Throgmorton. It was purely calculated, as the very timing of it shows, to promote the grand purpose of a resignation. This was obtained. And *the idea was heard of no more for months*. The rebels had obtained their resignation, however, not by the force of their reported letters, not by any indicated dangers, but by applications of a more
impressive

impressive nature, by denunciations of immediate death. Yet this was not known to the world. They asserted the contrary. And nobody could disprove it. In this state they continued, perfectly satisfied with the resignation, and totally unmindful of any letters of Mary's for some months. They then saw it requisite to summon a parliament, in order to procure a seeming sanction to all their measures, and a seeming security to all their persons. This was certainly a very bold step. But they prepared very cautiously for it. They provided themselves with a double suit of armour, for the encounter. They felt severely the embarrassment, which the compulsory nature of the resignation threw in their road. They must clear it away, or they must fall over it. They accordingly made use of expedients, that show at once the desperateness of their resolution, and the flagitiousness of their hearts. They prepared some peers WHO WERE NOT PRESENT, ready to SWEAR solemnly to the voluntariness of the resignation. They prepared equally some notaries publick, WHO WERE EQUALLY NOT PRESENT, ready to subscribe formal instruments of attestation to this voluntariness. And they resolved upon a set of forged letters, that should presume to call themselves Mary's writing, and should convict her of murder. To such heights of hellish impiety did they determine to mount, upon this occasion! The suborned notaries, and suborned peers, were to prove the freedom of the resignation. The forged letters were to prove, that, even if the
 resignation

resignation was *not* free, yet the deposition was just and reasonable. She had been concerned in the murder of her husband. She was convicted of the concern, by the evidence of her own letters. And she was therefore unfit perhaps to live, and certainly unfit to reign. There was indeed an obvious contradiction, between the letters and the other testimonies. *These* were to show her deposition just. *These* were to prove her resignation free. But the same contradictoriness, as I have remarked before, always attended them in their movements afterwards; and was the mark of CAIN, set upon them for their conduct by the hand of Providence. And what are contradictions to such CAINS as these, who are sweeping violently to the accomplishment of their purposes, with PERJURY marshalling them on their way, and with FORGERY bearing up their train for them?

Some days before the parliament was to meet, they assembled in council together, to project their measures against the meeting. Their *avowed* aim, was to justify all their proceedings against Mary, if the resignation should be deemed a compulsion; and their *secret* one, which went hand in hand with the other though unseen, was to frighten Mary into a voluntary resignation afterwards. To prove the former resignation free, they had already, no doubt, provided their swearing peers and their attesting notaries. But they must now contrive some mode of vindicating their conduct, if they should be voted to have deposed their sovereign. For this indeed, *they* cannot

cannot want arguments. They have been always complaining of her government. Religion has been in continual danger, from her keen propensities to popery and persecution. Liberty has been nearly strangled with a bow-string, by the ready and obsequious mutes, that have always attended behind the chair of this imperious sultana of Scotland. And they have, so recently as the 24th of July before, determined solemnly, we know, to arraign her for TYRANNY: and, specifically, “for breach and violation of their laws and decrees of the realme, as well that which they do call common laws, as their statute laws; and namely, the breach of those statutes, which were enacted in her absence, and confirmed by Mons. de Randam and Mons. d’Osell, in the French king her husband’s name and hers.” They said so then; but they dare not go upon it now. Religion is generally reported to be most in danger, when there are *many* attached to religion, and when there are a *few*, that want to make *their* attachment subservient to their own ambition. Liberty has always the greatest clamours made for its safety, when it is least in hazard of being hurt, and when the very clamours bespeak its security most strongly. And indeed we may say of Mary, I believe, with strict propriety; what has been said of one of her royal predecessors, “the gracious Duncan.” She, like him,

Had borne her faculties so meek, had been
So clear in her great office; that her virtues

Will plead, like angels, trumpet-tongued, against
THE DEEP DAMNATION OF HER TAKING-OFF;
And pity, like a naked new-born babe,
Striding the blast, or heaven's cherubin, hors'd
Upon the fightless couriers of the air,
Shall blow the horrid deed in every eye,
That tears shall drown the wind.

Nor let this be thought, a mere flight of poetical imagination. It is historically true, in the general idea. The acts of tyranny specified above, are proved at once to be fictitious, by the anachronisms in them. The rebels mean, the ordinances of their pretended parliament in August 1560. But neither Monsieur de Randan nor Monsieur D'Oysel, nor both together, ever had any commission to confirm those ordinances, either from Francis or from Mary. They had even left the kingdom, before those ordinances were past, and in the month of July before. And those ordinances, being made by subjects and unfancied by royalty, were very naturally therefore considered as the mere statutes of sedition, and left in their original nothingness of authority; till months after this accusation was uttered, even till sedition was once more in the chair of power, and one parliament in rebellion, during the month of December, 1567, confirmed what another had passed before*.

For these reasons, and preparatory to this parliament, the rebels were greatly puzzled on what to found their own vindication. They met re-

* Goodall, i. 32, Keith, 145 and 154, Melvill, 26, by mistake printed for 31, and Haynes, 358.

peatedly to consult upon the subject. They reasoned at considerable length upon it. Yet they were still puzzled. So difficult was it to find any solid ground of complaint, against this abused princess! Nor is this said upon any common authority. I speak it upon the credit of a publick record. This is not even a record of Mary's friends. It is of her very enemies, and of her bitterest enemies too. It is an "act of secret counsel," a register of their own proceedings, written in their own council-books, and signed by their own regent and counsellors. "Apud Edinburgh," it says, "quarto die mensis Decembris, Anno Dom. 1567. The whiche daie my Lorde Regentis Grace, the lordes of secrete counsale, and uthers, baronis, and men of jugement,—being convenit in counsale; it was proponit unto them, *that the parliament now approchis*, wheirin the CAUSE of the APPREHENSION and RETENINGE of the Quene—*mon be debaitit, ressonit, and tryit*; and it found and declarit, qhither [whether] the noblemen and others, quhilkis tuke armes before the saied apprehension, and whiche joyned with them and assistit them *at that time*, or ony wise *sensyne* [since], has donne the dewetie of noble-men, gud subjectis, and nawise offendit nor transgressit the lawes in *that fact*, or *anie thing depending thiron*, outhir [either] *preciding* or *followinge* the same, or not; and in caise it be found that they have not offendid, but done their dewtie, HOW and BE WHAT MEANE a full and perfect law and securitie

“maie be obtanit and maid for all them, that
 “other [either] be deid, counsale, or subscription
 “hes enterit in that cause sen the beginnunge:
 “THE MATTER BEING LARGELIE AND WITH
 “GUD DELIBERACION RESSONIT AT GREAT
 “LENGTH, AND UPON SONDRY DAIES,” &c*.

At length, however, they came to one unanimous resolution. They had taken into their view, the whole compass of Mary’s publick and private conduct. They had looked into all the possibilities of calumniation, from them. They could find no ground of accusation in either or in both, that would stand the inspection, even of one of their own parliaments. And they must

Call up spirits from the vasty deep,

to assist them in some infernal deed of FORGERY; before they can fix any imputations upon her. “At last,” they say themselves, “all the saied
 “lords, barronis, and others—, CAN FIND NO
 “OTHER WAY OR MOYEN how to find or make
 “the saied securitie, BUT be oppynyng [open-
 “ing] and reveling of the trewth and grund of
 “the hail matter;—IN AS FAR AS, BE DIVERS
 “HIR PREVIE LETTRES,—SENT BY HIR TO
 “JAMES ERLLE BOITHWELL, cheiffe executor of
 “the—horrible murdor,—IT IS MOST CERTEINE
 “THAT SHE WAS PREVIE, ART AND PART, AND
 “OF THE ACTUALL DEVISE AND DEID, OF
 “THE—MURTHUR OF THE KINGE †.” This is the most decisive vindication of Mary, that can

* Appendix, No. i.

† Ibid. ibid.

be invented or executed by the powers of man. Even to him who believes the letters to be genuine, it is a full vindication of all her *publick* behaviour. And to him, who “*mecum et cum Jove sentit,*” and is firmly persuaded of the spurioufness of the letters; it is so full and so decisive an attestation, to the justness and mildness of her government, and to the propriety, amiableness, and exemplariness of her personal behaviour; as perhaps no other Queen ever had.

Thus did the rebels in vain endeavour, to find some ground of accusation against Mary, within all the regions of reality! Thus did they stand at that awful moment, self-convicted of all their former falsehoods, and self-condemned for all their former rebellions, against her! At last LETHINGTON, probably, relieved them. The idea, over which his imagination had brooded for a while in the end of July preceding, would now recur undoubtedly to his memory. He had then reported it as a fact, to Throgmorton. He now suggested it as a fancy, to his associates. They were struck with it. They had no other resource. They could “*find no other way or moyen,*” for their justification. Nor could “*the richtnesness of their quarrel, and the securitie of them and their posteritie, BE ONY OTHER MEANE—be providit and establisht* *.” They therefore caught at it hastily. The impudence of the act alarmed not their spirits. The enormity of the villainy deterred not their consciences. They

* Appendix, No. i,

were in desperate circumstances. They must make some desperate exertions, for their own delivery. And they determined upon a bold forgery, that should bring home the charge of murder itself to the face of Mary*.

Lethington was accordingly requested, no doubt, to carry his own plan into execution immediately. They had fat many days on the business before. Another day was appointed at a little distance, for another consultation. In the mean time, Lethington went to work. All “the
“spirits of the vasty deep,” we may presume, hovered over him during the operation. He completed it. And at the next council such chiefs of the faction, as were in the infernal secrets of it, expressed to the rest; that they were

* So “Lethington,” upon a similar occasion, “soon gave them ease, by proposing the destruction of David;” and “the hint was well received” (Crawford, 7). The fertility of this man’s genius, thus gave birth to the two grand and melancholy incidents of Mary’s political life. It afterwards gave birth also to another, of a very different kind, the memorable plan of marrying Mary to the Duke of Norfolk (Murdin, 164 and 179). This last indeed was first proposed to Lethington in May 1565, *by that very court of Elizabeth’s*, which afterwards pretended to resent it so much (Murdin, 759). And Lethington, who very naturally disliked it for his Queen, while she was in the full pride of her prosperity, took it up afterwards for her when she was in an English prison, and so put life and spirit into it. Accordingly, when Lethington began to leave the rebels, and to exert his abilities against them, John Knox then put this marginal remark to his history of 1562: “Let the world be judge now
“1571; for Lethington then was, as he now is, THE FA-
“THER OF ALL MISCHIEF” (Knox, Life of the Author, i, and Hist. 322).

convinced

convinced from their experience, of the impossibility of vindicating their conduct to the Queen, except by doing what they had hitherto refrained from doing, and what they were now most unwilling to do, out of their great regard for the Queen, whose character must suffer severely from the deed; but that their own vindication, their own security, and the justice of their common cause, could not, by any other way or means possible, be made and shown to the world; and that therefore they were compelled at last, to adduce the LETTERS in evidence against her, to charge her from them with the murder of her late husband, and so to exhibit her to the eye of her subjects, as one deserving all which had been or could be inflicted upon her. They “ can
 “ find no other way or moyen how to find or
 “ make the faied securitie, but be oppynyng
 “ and reveling of the trewth and grund of the
 “ haill matter, fra the beginninge, plainlie and
 “ uprichtlie; quilk (in sa far as the manifestation
 “ theirol maie tend to the dishonor or defestima-
 “ tion of the Quene) they air maist loith to entre
 “ in, FOR THAT LUIF THEY BEARE UNTO HIR
 “ PERSON,—and FOR—THAY MONY GUDE AND
 “ EXCELLENT GIFTS AND VIRTUES, QUHARE-
 “ WITH GOD SOMETIMES INDOWIT HIR; gif
 “ otherwise the sinceritie of their intentions and
 “ procedings from the beginninge, myt be
 “ known to forrein nacions, and the inhabitantes
 “ of this isle (of whome mony yit remains in sus-
 “ pence in judgement) fatisfiet and resolvit of
 “ the richtnesness of their quarrel, and the secu-

“ritie of them and their posteritie, be ony other
“meane, myght be providit and establisshed.”
They then say, That all which has been done to
the Queen, “wes *in the saied Quene’s awin de-*
“*fault*, in as far as be divers hir previe lettres,”
&c. And the hypocrisy of parts here, shows suf-
ficiently of itself the villainy of the whole.

In this manner, did the pretended letters of
Mary come into existence. They were fabricated
in the end of November, and the beginning of
December, 1567. Their *name-day* was actually
the FOURTH of December. This we must there-
fore consider as the day of their birth, and date
their existence from it. On the FOURTH of De-
cember they made their appearance, nearly SIX
MONTHS after the pretended seizure of them upon
the person of Dalgleshe, and more than FOUR
MONTHS after the report of them to Throgmor-
ton. And they now appeared, equally as they
were then reported, with no specification of HOW,
and WHEN, and WHERE, they came into the
hands of the rebels; with no notes of that exul-
tation and triumph, which was sure to have been
shown, on the discovery of the ONLY possible
vindication of their conduct; and with plain
marks of forgery upon them, from the TIME of
their appearance, so different from that in Throg-
morton’s letter and that in the rebel journal; from
the LUCKINESS of it, as the rebels were confes-
sedly then in a state of the greatest embarrassment,
concerning their vindication to parliament; from
the unnatural hypocrisy of SORROW, with which
the rebels introduced them to the council; and
from

from the strong STRESS and deep EMPHASIS, which the rebels yet laid upon them in spite of their sorrow, as a certain evidence of the Queen's share in the murder, and a clear justification of all that they had done to her.

But, before I close the section, let me subjoin one remark to the whole. The letters were first formed on the 4th of December. Yet the rebels *posteriously* dated the discovery of them, on the 20th of June preceding; and *at the time* first mentioned them, on the 24th of July. On the 4th of December however, *betwixt* their dating and their mentioning them, they insinuated A NEW ÆRA for the discovery of them. In their act of council on that day, they “desires it to be
“found and declarit,” and it was accordingly found and declared in a special law for the purpose, “be the estates and haill body of the parliament: that the cause and occasion of the
“*previe convenfionis* and *messages* of the erles,
“lords, noblemen, and baronis, and others faithful and trew subjects; and *consequentlie* their
“taking of armes, and cominge to the fields with
“oppin and displait baneris,” on or before the 10th of June; “and the cause and occasion of
“the tacking of the Quene's person upon the
“15th daie of Junii last bypast, and holding and
“deteininge of the same within the hous and
“place of Lochlevin continewallie sensyne, presentlie, and in all tymes comyng; and generalle
“rallie all other things inventit, spokin, writtin,
“or donne be them, or aney of them, sen the
“tent daie of February last bypast—; wes in the
“saied

“saied Quene’s awin default, in as far as be divers
 “hir previe lettres—it is most certeine, that she
 “was previe,—and of the actuall devise and
 “deid, of the—murther of the kinge*.” They
 thus ground their consignment of the Queen to a
 prison, on the 16th of June; their appearance in
 arms against her, on the 10th; their secret mes-
 sages of sedition, and their private conventions
 for rebellion, before; and their whole conduct
 concerning Bothwell and Darnly, even so far
 back as the murder of Darnly on the 10th of Fe-
 bruary; upon letters, which they said they disco-
 vered on the 20th of June. But they had not
 said so, *then*. They had not *yet* fixed any day
 for the discovery. They were therefore free to
 rove at large, concerning it. And they accord-
 ingly insinuate it now, to have been made on
 some day *antecedent* to the 20th of June. That
 they could not *now* mean, to justify all that they
 had done *before* the 20th, by letters found *on* the
 20th; is obvious, I think. It would form, as I
 have hinted already, such a splendid instance of
 the fatuity of usurpation, as the world has never
 seen. An astonishing instance of fatuity, indeed,
 it forms at present. But then it forms the in-
 stance, by a combination of the *posterious* date of
 the discovery, with the dates and facts in this act
 of council. And, however such a *combination*
 may decisively show the infatuation, yet the rebels
 could never be so far gone in idiotcy, as to show
 it *all together*. Their *memories* might so far fail,

* Appendix, No. i. and ii.

but their *common-sense* could not be so thoroughly vitiated, as to lead them into such an exhibition of drivelling stupidity in themselves. They insinuate therefore the discovery of the letters, to have been *antecedent* to the 20th of June; by grounding proceedings antecedent to the 20th, upon them. They thus intimate the discovery, to have been *prior to the 10th of June*. They even intimate it, to have been *previous to the 10th of February*; though some of the letters, by their own accounts, were actually *unwritten* then. They knock down one ninepin, in endeavouring to set up another. And they finally throw down all, by making them mutually and successively to strike one another.

§ II.

WE have thus at last come, to the true and real origin of the letters. Let us now, therefore, trace out their history afterwards, and mark the revolutions which they underwent in the course of time. Like all other things beneath the moon, they sustained some shocks and suffered some convulsions, which greatly affected their frame. And every one of these will serve, to prove the original forgery of the whole.

But let us first see, what alterations they had received in the interval, between the report made of them to Throgmorton, and the appearance of them in the council. Some they had undoubtedly received. Every authour knows the difference, between a work traced and delineated upon the mind, and the same work drawn out and completed

completed upon paper. And there is that difference, between the letters which were described to Throgmorton, and the letters which appeared afterwards. They obviously differ, in two very striking particulars. “I do perceive,” says Throgmorton, “if these men cannot by fair means induce the Queen to their purpose; they mean to charge her with the MURDER of her husband, whereof (they say) they have as apparent proof against her as may be, as well by the testimony of her own handwriting, which they have recovered, as also by sufficient witnesses.”

Both of them agree, in pretending to prove the guilt of murder upon Mary. But Throgmorton’s are “AS APPARENT PROOF AS MAY BE,” of the crime. And the posteriour letters only attempt to prove it, by dark hints and dubious intimations; by expressions, which convey no intelligence of murder in themselves, and which, without the subsequent act of murder, would not convey any intelligence at all. That this is really the case, may be readily shown; by comparing the accounts of these letters, as given equally by the friends and the enemies of Mary, with the account, which the rebels themselves gave of the others to Throgmorton. “For the alledgit writingis, in form of missive letters or epistles,” says one of Mary’s commissioners on December the 17th, 1568; “quhilk *makis na faith speciallie*, quhair [as] in the samin NO WORD IS DISPOSING, OR GIVING EXPRESS COMMAND*.” If it be al-

* Appendix, No. xii,

ledged, say a number of Mary's nobles on the 12th of September before, "that hir Majestie's
 "writing—fould preive hir Grace culpabill; it
 "may be answerit, that there is IN NA PLACE
 "MENTIOUN MADE IN IT, BE THE QUHILK
 "HIR HIENES MAY BE CONVICT [of murder],
 "albeit it were hir awin hand-writ, as it is not*."
 "There is nothing in the letters," adds Mr. Goodall, "that could plainly show the writer to
 "have been in the fore-knowledge, counsel, or
 "device of any murder, far less to have per-
 "suaded or commanded it; and as little is there,
 "about maintaining or justifying any murder-
 "ers †." And I shall close all with an account
 of them, and of the proof of murder in them,
 from Dr. Robertson himself. Of this, he de-
 clares, "there are only IMPERFECT HINTS, OB-
 "SCURE INTIMATIONS, and DARK EXPRES-
 "SIONS, in the letters ‡." Such writings, there-
 fore, could never have been the evidences de-
 scribed to Throgmorton. Such letters could never

* Appendix, No. xii.

† Goodall, i. 76.

‡ Diff. 25. And see also Mr. Hume, v. 146—147. Mr. Tytler, in a new edition of his work, endeavours to refute this assertion of Dr. Robertson's. He therefore goes to the *sonnets*, as equally a part of the evidences with the letters. And he produces a passage from them, in opposition to the Doctor. But Mr. Tytler (I make the remark with great respect for him) has here fallen into a confusion of ideas, which the *posterious* date of the passage could alone have produced. He means the *adultery*, while the Doctor means the *murder*. And he appeals to the *sonnets* in support of his argument, when, in this mis-direction of it, he might equally have appealed to the letters themselves. P. 126—131. Edit. 3d.

have

have been called by the rebels, “as apparent
“proof” of the murder, “as might be.” The
two sets of letters, indeed, stand in a direct op-
position to each other. Both pretend to prove
the murderous guilt of Mary, from the testimony
of her own handwriting. But one set comes
forward as a full and explicit proof against her,
and the other only as a faint and feeble evidence.
That fixes the murder upon her with a peremp-
tory tone of assurance, while this presumes only
to insinuate it. That trumpets her guilt in the
market-place, and this is content to whisper it in
the reeds.

So characteristically different, were the letters
produced at London in 1568, from the letters
described at Edinburgh in 1567! But they
were also differenced from each other, by another
circumstance, which is of an *external* nature, and
may therefore appear more striking still to my
readers. The former were corroborated by *living*
testimonies. The latter *never pretended to any*.
This is very remarkable. It is also very evident.
Concerning “the murder of her husband,”
Throgmorton tells us, “—they say they have as
“apparent proof as may be; as well by the tes-
“timony of her own handwriting, which they
“have recovered, as also BY SUFFICIENT WIT-
“NESSES.” They *then* meant to have fortified
the credit of their forged epistles, with the con-
current attestations of some of their suborned de-
pendents. They had them all ready for the
work in reality or imagination, on the 24th of
July, 1567. Yet they never produced them.
And

And they never offered to produce even a single witness, either at York or at Westminster, to Mary's share in the murder. So greatly did they alter their plan after Throgmorton wrote! We have previously seen them altering it essentially, with regard to the *contents* of the letters. We now find them changing it intirely, with respect to the *confirmation* of them. They even changed it, in a seemingly retrograde kind of absurdity. When their letters were full of the murder of the King, they thought it prudent to superadd the security of witnesses. When their letters conveyed only dark and imperfect intimations, concerning the murder; they thought it unnecessary to add any witnesses at all. And yet this was the genuine result of unfounded villainy, bold at the outset, suspicious in the progress, restless in its spirit, and shifting in its measures.

When the rebels first formed the design of a number of letters, that should convict Mary of murder under her own hand; they very naturally resolved to make them explicit, concerning the murder. They were to form them for this end. They would therefore not confine themselves, to dubious hints of her guilt. Hints would be too weak for their purpose. Dubiousness would be too frigid for their zeal. They would take care to mark her enormity, in clear and peremptory terms. The grand object of crimination would come forward to view. Page after page would point at it. And a full blaze of light would be thrown upon it, from every quarter.

quarter. Such would be the natural operation of the mind, when it delineated the plan to itself. Such also, by their own account, appears to have been the actual operation of their minds. They made their imaginary letters to form, “as apparent a proof as might be,” of the participation of Mary in the murder. Nor were they content even with this. They would go farther. Not a loop-hole should be left, to hang a doubt of her guilt upon. And they provided “sufficient witnesses,” to co-operate with the written evidence.

But when the ardour of conception was cooled, when the eagerness of crimination had spent itself, and they calmly reflected on their own purposes afterwards; the ever-wakeful spirit of suspicion began to stir itself, in the bosoms of these profligates. They saw the peril they should be in, from their corroborating evidences. Witnesses, however steeled with impudence and impiety, might yet relent, recede, and retract. Their advanced posts would thus betray them. And their very outworks would be turned against them. They therefore determined to cut off this dangerous accession of strength. They resolved to contract the dimensions of their ground. They will draw all their forces into their camp. And they will there secure themselves, behind the lines of their letters. Letters are more manageable than witnesses. *They* will never relent, recede, or retract. *They* will always speak, whatever their prompters choose they should.

But even *these* are to be formed upon a new plan.

plan. It violates every principle of probability, to suppose that letters, with such a plenitude of murderous evidence in them, should be sent WITHOUT THE GUARD OF A SEAL. Yet the rebels were compelled to send them without it. Mary had still her own seal in her own possession. Her commissioners, say Elizabeth's on the 6th of October, 1568, "produced a commyffion writ-
 "ten on paper, subscribed by the Quene of Scotts
 "hand, and *sealed with her signet* *." Mary also, in the December and January following, sent them "twa several writingis—, subscribed
 "with her awin hand, and *under hir signet* †." And, for this reason, "the alledgit writingis in
 "form of missive letteris or epistles," says an authour at the time, and in an address to Elizabeth herself, "are not—SEILLIT nor SIG-
 "NETIT ‡." They were neither attested by her seal at the bottom, nor secured by her seal on the outside. And such a display of murderous guilt in an *open* letter, would have counteracted its own purposes, would have shocked the faith of credulity itself, and have proved eventually a full vindication of Mary. They therefore addressed themselves to the business, in a different manner from what they had once designed. They were obliged to pull that little creation to pieces, which had been formerly modelled in their minds. They were obliged to form a new one, of fresh materials. They took particular care, to avoid the original fault of their plan.

* Goodall, ii. 113. † Ibid. 311. ‡ Appendix, No. xii.

The broad and open day-light of murder, which was to be thrown over *that*, was shaded off and softened away in *this*. The strokes concerning the murder, were now touched with such a gentle hand, that they might with the greatest safety be committed, even to an *open* letter.

But, in the usual precipitancy of the human mind, the rebel operations ran as much into an excess in diminishing, as the rebel imaginations had gone before in aggravating, the evidence of murder against Mary. They have shaded away the light so much, which was to play upon this, once capital, object in the piece; that they have not left a single ray, to show it. Mary's concern in the murder, disappears from the face of the whole. We are aware indeed that the letters were produced, as proofs of murder intended by her. This therefore lends a spur to our acuteness, and furnishes wings to our imagination. By the aid of both, we lengthen the imperfect hints into intimations, we enlighten the dark, and we ascertain the dubious. But to a man who has his imagination properly at rest, and his acuteness not improperly stimulated; it appears surprising, that the letters should ever have been produced, as vouchers of murder, at all. Accordingly we observe of the rebels themselves, that, at their first production of them before the commissioners of Elizabeth, they would not submit them even to these partial and credulous examiners; without previously prepossessing them, concerning her share in the murder. "For our better instruction," say the commissioners themselves,

3

selves, “after declaration of such circumstances, “as led and induced to vehement presumptions, “to judge her guiltie of the said murder;” they showed the letters *. And so those writings, which once formed, in the opinion of their very planners, “as apparent a proof” of murder “as “might be,” against Mary; are now, in the opinion of their very makers, unable to bear the weight of any proof themselves, and obliged to be propped and shored up by declarations, inductions, and presumptions from without. They cannot indeed support any proof. They can hardly maintain a strong suspicion.

§ III.

THERE is also another circumstance concerning the letters, which equally shows the delineated originals of them, to be materially different from the actual copies. This is likewise intimated to us, by a passage in Throgmorton’s dispatches. And it runs thus. “They mean,” says that embassadour, “to charge her,” Mary, “with INCONTINENCY, as well with the Earl “Bothwell, as with others; having (as they say) “sufficient proof against her for this crime.”

The rebels *then* formed the project, which they pursued afterwards. They resolved to charge her, as they charged her afterwards in the letters, with the crime of adultery. So far they were consistent in their plan! But this was all their consistency. They *then* designed to accuse her of adul-

* Appendix, No. v.

tery, *without the aid of the letters*. This is plain from the manner, in which Sir Nicholas speaks of the two accusations of adultery and of murder. For the latter, he tells us, “they say they have as “apparent proof against her as may be, as well “by the testimony of her own handwriting, which “they have recovered, as also by sufficient witnesses.” But for the former, he adds, “they “have (as they say) SUFFICIENT PROOF AGAINST “HER.” The letters, we see, are restricted entirely to the charge of murder. They have no connection with the charge of adultery. *This* is founded wholly on the same groundwork, upon which one half of the other rests, on “sufficient “witnesses,” as it is called in the former accusation, or on “sufficient proof,” as it is denominated in the latter. And no *letters* were then pretended to be recovered by the rebels, that could substantiate at all a charge of adultery against Mary.

Nor was the adultery, that was thus to be brought home to her by *witnesses*, confined entirely to Bothwell. No! It was extended to others. “They mean to charge her with incontinency,” says Throgmorton, “as well with the Earl Bothwell, as with others.” And for her adulterous commerce with others, as well as with him, “they “had (as they said) sufficient proof against her.” They therefore meant to brand her as a woman of wantonness, deserted by all sense of modesty, and given up to an unbridled licentiousness of life. They had their witnesses ready to prove it all. Mary was to appear, as the very Messalina of her court.

court. Bothwell and others were to be shown, as successively the implements of her loose gratifications. And she was to be exhibited in colours of infamy, even much more glowing than those, in which these miscreant sons of detraction exhibited her afterwards, by the prostituted pencil of a Buchanan.

They afterwards contracted their plan upon this, as well as the other points of accusation. They discharged all their witnesses. They resolved to find different evidence. They left Buchanan to *hint* at her story of shame with "OTHERS." But they resolved, that neither he nor they should *insist* upon it. They determined to tell only her commerce with "EARL BOTHWELL." They made the adultery accessory to the murder. They united the two charges together. And they engrafted the whole upon the letters. They thus cut off all *living* evidences. They disengaged themselves from those dangerous auxiliaries, which, like the elephants in ancient war, were as likely to make head against their employers, as to fight for them; and, on any sharp attack from the enemy, would be almost sure to turn upon their friends, and trample them to death. They prepared to bring forces into the field, which they could keep under better command. *Written* testimonies would maintain their posts, with all the heavy bravery of Russians. Like them, they might be beaten down indeed by superiour power. But, like them also, they could never be forced to fly.

So very striking an alteration was now made,

in the form and fashion of the letters! At first they had not a hint in them, of any adulterous wickedness. They told only of the murder. This was all the dreadful secret, that they were charged to convey. And the adultery was to be published, by *vivâ voce* evidence. But now they have been taught another lesson. They have been made to forget, nearly, all their former tale of murder. They have taken up a new one of adultery. And this adultery is all with Bothwell.

In doing this however, the rebels, equally as before, overshot the mark at which they were aiming. With all the hasty indiscretion, with which they meant to display the guilt of murder in the first letters; they actually blazoned out the impudence of adultery, in the second. This appears so strong upon the face of the letters now, that Mary must have been a Messalina indeed, to have written as they dictated to her. And yet, to aggravate the absurdity, they describe this very Messalina of their own making, as attached entirely to *one*, as devoted entirely to *his* love, and as resigned up, in body and in soul, entirely to *his* will.

The natural indelicacy of their *masculine* minds, disabled them from giving us one touch of love purely feminine. They knew little more of the passion, than the impulses of instinct and the sensitiveness of nature. They therefore described a most accomplished princess, as addressing her lover with all the grossness of a mere man. But this was not all. They knew not how to paint a queen, in love with one of her subjects. They therefore

therefore represent her, as acting with all the sneaking humility of a cottager to a peer. And from some strange predominancy of meanness, real or affected, in the personal fabricator of the whole, they give her at times the very tone of vulgarity in love. A few instances will show this. I shall take them just as they arise. “*The devil finder us,*” she is made to exclaim, “and God knit us togidder for ever, for the maist faithfull coupill that ever he unitit: *this is my faith, I will die in it**.” I am, she says in another place, “verray glaid to wryte unto zow quhen the rest are sleipand; sen I cannot sleip as thay do, and *as I wald desyre*, that is, *in zour armes*, my deir lufe †.” “Waryit mot this pokische [pocky] man be,” her husband, “that causes me haif sa mekle pane; for, without him, I suld have *an far plesander subject to discorse upon* ‡.” “Seing to obey zow, my deir lufe, I spair nouthir honour, conscience, *harsarde, nor greitnes quhatsumevir*; tak it, I pray zow, in gude part,” as from “the maist faithful luifer that ever ze had, or ever fall have §.” “Zour humble and faithful lufe *hopis to be schortly ane uther thing to zow*, for the reward of my irksom travellis ||.” “Now, Schir, I have brokin my pomeis; becaus ze *commandit* me nouthir to wryte nor fend unto zow: zit I have not done this to *offend* zow: and gif ze knew the feir yat I have presently, ze wald not have *sa mony contrary suspiciounis* in zour thocht;

* Vol. ii. L. i. S. xviii.

† Ibid. S. xix.

‡ Ibid. S. xx.

§ L. i. S. xxxiii.

|| Ibid. S. xxxiv.

“ quhilk notwithstanding I *treit and chereis*, as
 “ proceeding from *the thing in the world, that I*
 “ *maist desyre*, and *seikis fastest to haif*, quhilk is
 “ zour gude grace; *of the quhilk my behaviour fall*
 “ *assure me* *.”

Such was the coarse *kirtle* and the homely *neckatee*, in which these wretched representers of Mary dressed themselves up, for the exhibition of a Queen, dignified, refined, and elegant. But their desire to fix the imputation of adultery strongly upon her, blinded them to all the folly of their conduct. They were even hurried by it, into still greater extravagancies. The Queen was made to express all this violence of affection, for her adulterer; to show all this contempt and hatred, for her husband; to speak all this earnestness, for a speedy separation from the one, and a speedy union with the other; and to utter all this eagerness, for being in the other's arms at that moment; in letters that were sent UNSEALED, that were sent by DIFFERENT MESSENGERS, and were sure to be read by the bearers, and reported by them to others. And thus the writings, which once had not a single stain of adultery upon them, are now polluted with open and un-covered adultery, from end to end.

§ IV.

THESE two, very pointed, proofs of variation in the form and substance of the letters, re-

* L. iii. S. ii. See also Vol. ii. Lett. 6. Sect. 3. Note 9. to account for all this.

flect each a lustre upon the other, serve each to confirm and corroborate the other, and make both to evidence the forgery of all in the clearest manner. But these took place before the letters had been properly presented by their fabricators to the publick. They were spoke of indeed, and they were described. They were spoke of, by a personage of the first authority among the rebels. They were described by him to an embassadour of Elizabeth's, who was sent to negotiate with the rebels, and who was confidentially entrusted with their designs at times. Yet they had not been written then. They were therefore in the womb of time, as yet. What alterations this litter of deformity might *there* undergo, would necessarily be invisible to the world at large. But the litter were brought to light afterwards. And, even then, they were continually licked into form, by the persevering applications or their parents.

The letters, as hastily traced upon the imagination of Lethington on July the 24th, 1567, were upon serious consideration rejected, in the moments of execution. Another set of letters was formed upon a different plan. The murder was to be no longer the whole. The adultery was to claim a share of attention. And both were to become the objects of the letters. This was done. A parliament was then summoned. The letters were produced in their new form. A violent law was passed against Mary. And Murray triumphed in the happy efficacy of his forgeries.

For

For this purpose was it, that the letters were first fabricated in themselves, and first produced to the publick. But the moments of their exhibition and birth, are the witnesses of their shame. And the triumph of Murray is dashed, by an exposure of his villainy. The letters betray the spurioufness of their origin, at their very first appearance in publick.

Preparatory to the meeting of parliament, as I have previously shown, Murray called a number of his friends together, and formed a privy council with them. This was continued on to the 4th of December, 1567. “The which daie,” says the journal of the council, “my lorde regentis
“ grace, the lordes of secret counsale, and uthers,
“ baronis, and men of judgement,—being convenit
“ in counsale;” it was determined to produce some letters in a handwriting fimilar to Mary’s, and to fix upon them a charge of murder against her. They accordingly produce the charge, and the letters, together. “Be divers hir previe let-
“ tres,” they say, “writtin and subscrivit with
“ hir awen hand, and sent by hir to James Erll
“ Boithwell,” &c.; “it is most certeine, that she
“ was previe, art and part, and of the actuall de-
“ vife and deid, of the—murther of the kinge*.”

When they planned the letters, the murder was the only object of them. When they executed them, the adultery was placed in the principal point of vision, and the murder was only seen, or thought to be seen, at a distance. Yet they persisted in their scheme of accusation, as

* Appendix, No. i.

if the letters were still in their original form. They charged Mary with murder upon the authority of letters, that had once been intended to have the evidences of murder very strong upon them, but in reality had never had any at all. And they never charged her with adultery upon the credit of writings, which were full of adultery in almost every page. But then these were originally meant, to have had no traces of adultery in them. The plan of effective operations was formed, upon the original model of the letters. And *that* was still pursued, when *this* was altered. Hence arises a very gross absurdity, upon the face of the rebel accusations. They adduce writings to prove a murder, of which the writings *know* nothing. They adduce writings that prove an adultery in the plainest manner, and yet ground not any accusation of adultery upon them. Their charges, and their evidences, are quite at cross purposes. And as this extraordinary fact is very clearly explained, by the variations made in the original form of the letters; so does it cast a light back upon those letters themselves, and confirm the conclusions, which we have drawn from Throgmorton's account of them. Nor do the evidences, and charges, appear with such averted faces to each other, merely at the present *out-set* of the business. They carried the same *Janus-like* appearance, in the middle and in the conclusion of it. Thus Murray, when he offered to have the letters shown to Elizabeth, calls them “*fic letteris*,—that sufficientlie, in our opinioun, prei-

“ vis hir consenting to the *murthure* of the king,
 “ hir lauchful husband *.” Thus also at York
 he and they exhibited the letters, for “ such mat-
 “ teir as they had, to condempne the Quene of
 “ Scottes of the *murder* of her husband †.” Thus
 again at Westminster they charged the Queen,
 with being “ of the foirknowledge, counsal, de-
 “ vise, perswader, and commandar, of the —
 “ *murder* ‡.” And to prove this they produced
 the letters, which proved no “ foreknowledge,”
 no “ counsel,” no “ devise,” no “ persuation,”
 and no “ command.” So strangely was the
 whole machine of accusations thrown off its center
 of rest, by the shock of the alterations already
 made in the model of the letters !

These writings, however, were laid before the
 parliament afterwards. But, as there was sure to
 be a large party there in favour of the Queen, the
 rebels, not content with all the precautions that
 they had taken before, tied up their tongues and
 hands at once, by a most extraordinary kind of
 additional charm. “ Sindrie nobilmen that was
 “ hir Grace’s favouraris,” say those very persons
 afterwards, “ then present, buir with all” the
 rebel proceedings there ; “ *maist principallie* for
 “ safety of hir Grace’s LYFE, quhilk, or thair
 “ cuming to parliament, was *concludit and sub-*
 “ *scriyvit be ane greit part of hir takeris*, to be
 “ TAKEN FRA HER IN MAIST CREWEL MAN-
 “ NER, as is *notourlie knawin* ||.” By the power

* Appendix, No. iii.

† Goodall, ii. 207.

‡ Ibid. No. v.

|| Goodall, ii. 360.

of this magick, they bound the friends of Mary fast. Her enemies were doubly active. The parliament consisted only of both. The letters were produced. And a law was passed exactly in the terms, in which the act of secret council had drawn it up before. It begins thus: “Item, “anent the artickle proponit be the erlis, lordis, “and uther nobillmen, quha tuik armis at Car- “barrie hill, upon the 15th day of Junii last by- “past.” And it finds, just as the act of secret council had found before, that all which had been done was “in the said Quenis awin default; in sa far “as, be divers hir previe letteris writtin halelie “with hir awin hand, and send be hir to James “sumtyme Erle of Bothwell, chief executour of “the—horribill murthour,—it is maist certane “that scho was previe,” &c*.

In the act of council the letters are described, as “writtin AND SUBSCRIVIT with hir awen hand;” and in the act of parliament, as “WRITTIN “HALELIE with hir awin hand.” Whence arises this difference? It is apparently a very extraordinary one. It strikes strongly upon the mind. And it is authenticated in the clearest manner. The letters, no doubt, were *exhibited* before the council. Even Murray could not have had the effrontery, to ask and to procure a *charge* of *murder* against Mary, upon the testimony of writings *not seen*. The council therefore saw them. Yet they represent them, “as written *and subscribed* with her “own hand.” They were certainly seen by the

parliament too. I know, indeed, that the friends of Mary to this day contend they were not. But I am constrained by the force of truth, to separate from them in this, as well as in some other points. Murray could still less than before have had the effrontery, to ask and procure a *sentence of murder* against Mary, upon the authority of writings that dared not to show their faces. And Murray and Mary's nobles concur to say expressly, that they were seen. On the Duke of Norfolk's privately proposing to Murray at York, not to produce his letters to the commissioners; "my reply to that was," says Murray himself, "how the matter had passed in parliament, and THE LETTERS SEEN TO MANY, so that the abstracting of the same could not then secure her to any purpose*." Murray's word indeed will not be readily admitted upon a dubious point, by either the friends of Mary or myself, without the concurrence of some other testimony. I hasten therefore to such a testimony. What pretended to be "hir Majestie's writing," the very nobles of Mary's party say, was "PRODUCIT IN PARLIAMENT †." Yet the parliament describe the letters, from an equal view of them with the council itself, in a manner essentially different; as NOT "written *and subscribed* by her own hand," but only as "written" by it, and as written "wholly" by it. Here we have vision against vision, and record against record. Which of them shall we take? We know not which to take. We

* Robertson, ii. 397.

† Goodall, ii. 360—361.

are floating betwixt two opposite tides. One drives us, to suppose the letters only *written* by the Queen. The other compels us, to believe them both *written and subscribed* by her. And which shall carry us away by its impulse, at last?

The former must, says Mr. Hume. The whole difficulty, according to his solution of it, results from “the inaccuracy or blunder of the clerk.” And “the mistake is easily accounted for: the letters were only wrote by her, the second contract with Bothwell was only subscribed; a proper accurate distinction was not made, and they were all said to be wrote and subscribed*.” Nor is “a proper accurate distinction” yet made. The *second* contract, indeed, pretended only to be subscribed. But the *first* pretended, equally with the letters at one time, to be both written and subscribed †. Having cleared up this little confusion, let us attend to the argument itself. And let us observe, in order to give a full energy to it, that the rebels on the 10th of December, 1568, when they declared at Westminster, “good honest men, full surely!” how they came by the evidences against Mary; spoke of them, “as writtin or subscrivit be hir hand ‡.” But then *they* speak of “divers missive letteris, sonnettis, obligatiounis or contractis for mariage, betwix the

* Hist. v. 148.

† Appendix, No. v. and xi.

‡ Goodall, ii. 92.

“Quene—and Erle Bothwille*.” And the acts of council and of parliament, as Mr. Tytler has very justly replied †, speak only of “her privie letters.” These alone are said by the parliament, to have been written wholly by her own hand. These alone are said by the council, to have been both written and subscribed by it. These alone *could* be mentioned or meant at all, by either. THEY ALONE WERE PRODUCED TO EITHER. The *contracts*, either first or second, were *not* produced. The *sonnets* were equally *not* produced. They could neither of them, therefore, be within the purview of the council. They could neither of them be, in the contemplation of the parliament. And Mr. Hume’s clerk, instead of being set down for a blunderer by his ingenious employer, must have been a much more ingenious man than himself; as he was possessed of the peculiar faculty, a superiour kind of second-sight in memory perhaps, of alluding to papers which he had never seen, of combining the stores of sight with the treasures of revelation in his mind, yet marking with some distinctness the real boundaries of both, and so referring half of his description to the one and half to the other.

So contemptible does Mr. Hume’s solution appear, when we bring it to the slightest test of trial! Yet a writer has recently stepped forth, in opposition to Mr. Tytler; and pronounced it

* Goodall, ii. 92.

† P. 9. Edit. 1st, which is the edition that I invariably use, except when I say to the contrary.

“not” a “contemptible” solution. This writer has given himself to the world, in “Miscellaneous Remarks” on Mr. Tytler’s work *. He is plainly an enemy to Mary, a disciple of Dr. Robertson’s or Mr. Hume’s. Most probably he is a pupil to the former †. But, whatever he is, he is evidently *very young*. He should have staid longer at the feet of his political Gamaliel, before he had ventured to become a teacher himself. He should have “staid at Jericho, till his beard “was grown.” And if a young man chose to be artful; if his youthful integrity would permit him to assume a disguise, he should have taken care to wrap it closely about him. He affects the air of one of Mary’s friends. Yet he writes with the venom of her enemies. He has not much indeed, because he has little strength. But he shows as much, as his strength will permit him to show. And, to apply the witty remark of a *Cavalier*, “young Sir Harry Vane, if he lives, “will come to be old Sir Harry.” He informs us in his first page, that “the intercourse between Mary and the Earl of Bothwell was ill-fated, and in its consequences disastrous; *but, “with respect to her, it was innocent.*” Yet, even after such an assertion, he plainly is endeavouring to make the epistolary part of that intercourse, appear to be genuine, and therefore guilty indeed; by answering the objections, that have

* Printed for Robson and Robinson, London, 1784.

† Dr. Robertson accordingly, in i. 137, edit. xi. appeals to his work, as containing “several ingenious remarks.”

been made to its genuineness. And this he does, under the disingenuous pretence of clearing the cause of Mary's vindication, from some arguments that injure it. Such has been the influence of the late writings in favour of Mary, upon the mind of the publick; that even an enemy is now obliged to put on the uniform of her friends, to place himself in the ranks with them, and to pretend a zeal for their cause.

He accordingly takes part with Mr. Hume, concerning this extraordinary variation in the records. He is even gallant enough, to come and assist him at the very moment of his defeat. And he has the generosity, to wish to cover the retreat which he had not power to stop. But his gallantry is greater than his prudence, and his generosity is superiour to his force. He has induced me by his interference, to follow the stunning blow which Mr. Tytler had given Mr. Hume, to pursue the enemy which he had obliged to retire, and to improve the success (I trust) into a complete discomfiture. And having done this, I turn upon the auxiliary himself. Mr. Hume's solution, he says, is "not contemptible, however much it may be despised by some men: "for as *letter of tack* and *letter of pension* are "phrases used in Scotland, so *letter of espousal* "may be proper enough*." This gentleman appears from many circumstances, to be a Scotchman. Indeed the subject of Mary's innocence or of Mary's guilt, has been almost entirely con-

* P. 7.

fin'd to the Scotch. And I know not whether I am not the first Englishman, that has written a large treatise professedly on the point. Yet, though a Scot, he is not much conversant with the idioms of the Scottish language. Had he been, he might have given a greater force to his argument, than he has done. I will do it for him, before I attack it. This will be acting with the honourableness of an old knight-errant. I acted with a little of this spirit, to Mr. Hume before. And I ought not to be less generous to his kind assistant. He wants it as much as he, though he came as an assistant to him.

The Scotch formerly denoted; and do denote still, I suppose; *all* sorts of writings, by the appellation of LETTERS. We do so in some measure ourselves, in the use of the word *letters* for literature. Hence come our authour's "letter of tack," and "letter of pension." Hence also a contract for marriage, may very analogously be denominated a "letter of espousal." And, what is decisive upon the topick, even *the very contract* mentioned by Mr. Hume, is expressly styled *a letter* by an authour of *the very time*. That authour is MURRAY himself. In enumerating the written evidences which he produced against Mary, he mentions "the contractis or obligatiounis for marriage,—and all *uthe*ris LETTERIS*." The Earl of Morton, also, speaks of them afterwards in the very same style exactly, as "contractis or obligatiounis for marriage,—and *uthe*ris LET-

* Appendix, No. iv.

“TERIS*.” But then they both distinguish very carefully, what common-sense requires every language to distinguish, betwixt epistolary and other writings. Murray mentions “all *missive letteris*, “*contractis* or *obligationis* for marriage, *sonettis* “or *luif-ballettis*, and all *utheris letteris*.” Morton specifies “the *missive letteris*, *contractis* or “*obligationis* for marriage, *sonettis* or *luif-bal-* “*lettis*, and *utheris letteris*.” The acts of council and parliament also, observing the same distinctiveness of language, speak of “her *privie* “*letters*.” These are evidently the same, with the “*missive letters*” of Morton and Murray. They are even said expressly by both the parliament and the council, to have been actually *missive*; being described by both, as “*divers hir* “*previe lettres*, *writtin and subscrivit*” or “*writ-* “*tin halelie*,” “*with hir awin hand*, and SENT “*by hir to James sumtyme Erll of Bothwell*.” And, as I have already noticed, *these* were the *only* letters or writings, that were produced before the council, or presented to the parliament.

So easily is the auxiliary defeated, as well as the principal! But the former afterwards comes forward, from his subordinate situation as an auxiliary; and assumes the tone and stalk of a principal himself. He thinks Mr. Hume’s argument not a bad one. But he has *a better of his own*. “*Another*,” he says, “and a more easy and obvious, solution may be suggested.” It is this. “He who writes a deed with his own hand,” he

* Appendix, No. iv.

says, “ does generally sign it; and it is hardly
 “ possible to figure a case of a perfect deed,
 “ written by the party’s own hand, and not signed
 “ by him: hence *written and subscribed* constantly
 “ go together in common language, just as *heirs*
 “ *and executors*. As every one, conversant in
 “ law-business, must have seen *executors* joined
 “ to *heirs*, in consequence of what may be termed
 “ the customary affinity between them, although
 “ the maker of the deed meant not to speak of
 “ executors; so, in like manner, the clerk of
 “ privy council might have added *subscrivit* to
 “ *written*. It appears that this inaccuracy was
 “ observed, and immediately corrected*.” Such
 is the “ more easy and obvious solution” suggested by this gentleman! But whether it is *more* obvious and easy than Mr. Hume’s may soon be settled. It is neither easy nor obvious at all. The very confusedness of it, shows this sufficiently. And nothing but the natural partiality, which the mind always bears to its own conceptions; or the equally natural unfixedness of a frivolous mind; could have induced him to mention it. It has two advantages, however, over Mr. Hume’s. It does not militate against the positive fact mentioned before. And, what perhaps is equally useful, it has so little pointedness in it, that it is not easy to meet its force.

The confusion of ideas, that prevailed in the authour’s understanding when he conceived the argument, appears very evident in his manage-

ment of it. Even as he states it himself, it amounts only to this, that so it might be. Yet, in the very next words, he assumes this argument of mere possibility, for an absolute evidence of reality. "The clerk of privy council," he says, "MIGHT have added *subscrivit* to *written*." And yet, as we are instantly told, "IT APPEARS" that he did add it; that "this inaccuracy" was actually committed by him, actually "OBSERVED," and "IMMEDIATELY CORRECT-ED."

Such is the whole of the argument, as stated by himself! Let us now examine the parts of it, as they stand before us. "He who writes a deed with his own hand, does generally sign it." This is surely a very strange position. Who writes a *deed* with his own hand? Not one in ten thousand. And if this gentleman be in the law, as from his allusion I take him to be, he hopes for the sake of the profession, I presume, that not one in ten thousand will ever do it; unless indeed he is one of those peculiarly malignant lawyers, who would be glad of confusion for the sake of advantage, would sacrifice the world to their gains, and are ready, in their rage for profit, to cry out with "the enraged Northumberland,"

Let heaven kiss earth! now let not nature's hand
Keep the wild flood confin'd! Let order die!

But when any one does write a deed with his own hand, it seems, he *generally* signs it. He
always

always signs it, if it be a deed. If he draws it up as a deed, he will equally as a deed sign it. But what connection has all this, with the letters before the council and parliament? It has this. "Hence *written and subscribed* constantly go together in common language, just as *heirs and executors*." The technical union of heirs and executors is very natural, because these are legally two grand and parallel links, in the chain of transmitted property. But is there any such union, or any such reason for an union, between the subscribing and the writing of a paper, whether a law-deed or not? Do deeds generally, or even ever, make use of the combination "written and subscribed," as they do of "heirs and executors?" Certainly not. The subscriber is almost always a different man, from the writer. And, even when he is not, none but an affected simpleton would think, if ever *one* thought, of recording upon his deed, that he *wrote* as well as subscribed it.

But even if all this was true; if the terms "written and subscribed" were as common associates in the language of the law, as "heirs and executors" are; what then? Would every or would any lawyer, from this frequent recurrence of the phrase, always superadd "subscribed" to "written," whenever he had occasion to mention the letters? Would he particularly, in mentioning any writing that was *not* subscribed, from the force of a merely mechanical bias, and in direct opposition to his own view of it, mention it as equally subscribed and written? The supposition

is sufficiently refuted, by the statement. The very question precludes all answer. But, even if he would, was the clerk of the council a lawyer, and the clerk of the parliament none; and were the acts, either of the parliament or of the council, usually drawn up in the law-language, practised within this gentleman's *forum justitiæ*? It does not appear, that either was. Nor were the acts of the council, any more than those of the parliament, ever said by the clerks to be written and subscribed by the members. They were both *subscribed* by them. Both these were particularly so *. But they were neither of them *written*. And this very act of council does not purport, to be either written or subscribed by them †.

I have pursued this ridiculous argument at a greater expence of time and words, than it had a right to claim at my hands; in order to show it ridiculous, in every principle and particle of it. It may thus serve as an useful specimen of the wretched reasoning, in which the adversaries of Mary are now compelled to take refuge. The clerk of the council was Alexander Hay, a notary publick ‡. He was used, as a publick notary, to draw up writings and to attest them. He was peculiarly, therefore, in the habits of accuracy. His very profession consisted in this. He saw the letters produced in form. He was

* Appendix, No. i. and ii. † Ibid. *ibid.*

‡ Goodall, ii. 84. See ii. 369, for a *clergyman* being a notary publick to Queen Mary.

to describe them. He therefore examined them. From that examination he described them. He necessarily described as he saw, and as they were. And he described them, as written and subscribed by Mary. He could not err concerning the subscription, any more than concerning the writing. He saw a subscription to them. He therefore noticed them as subscribed. And, what doubly precludes all possibility of a mistake, his description of them is authenticated in the fullest manner, by the signatures of the counsellors present; even by Murray himself, by Morton, and by a long train of others*.

But, when the letters were re-produced in parliament, the clerk there acted just as the clerk before had acted, and as all clerks must act in the same situation. He was James Makgill, "*Clericus Rotulorum Registri*," as he styles himself. He was a man of much more consequence, than the other. He drew up acts of parliament. He enrolled them in the journals of parliament. And he exemplified and attested them, for publication†. He saw the letters produced in parliament. He must have read them to the house. He was also to describe them in the new act. He equally examined and equally described them, with the clerk before. He equally described as he saw and as they were. And his description was equally authenticated, by being engrafted into a bill, by being passed in form through the

* Appendix, No. i.

† Goodall, ii. 381.

three estates in parliament, and being ratified into a law by the regent Murray *.

The original difficulty, then, subsists still in its full force. How shall we disengage ourselves from it? The plain fact was this.

When the rebels first formed their letters, for the accusation of Mary by the testimony of her own writing; they would be sure to form them, with the addition of her name at the end, as well as with the imitation of her hand in all. They accordingly drew up a little contract of marriage for her, exactly in this manner †. This indeed was the only manner, in which reason and propriety *could* induce them to draw up the letters. *A letter without a subscription, would be a perfect solecism in evidence.* It could therefore be never intended at first. Policy might afterwards drive them to it. But reason at first could never have led them. A monster may be generated by a collision of accidents. But it is not the regular production of nature. And the letters were actually presented to the privy council, with the customary appendage of subscription to them. They were then “WRITTEN AND SUBSCRIBED
“WITH HER OWN HAND.” But when these artificers of fraud, came to reflect still more closely on the approach of parliament, and to prepare their letters for the strict examination, which they

* So “the clerk of register,” says a letter from Randolph to Cecil, August the 10th, 1560, “immediately stood up, and asked them to what matter they would proceed” (Robertson, ii. 321).

† See it in iii. 4. 1.

must expect from the friends of Mary there; they began to shrink, at the thoughts of what they had done. To substantiate the charge by letters under her own hand, they had necessarily annexed her own subscription. But that letters, containing intimations of adultery and of murder, should be sent with her subscription to them, and yet without any guard of a seal upon them; exceeded all the bounds of credibility. They were struck with the absurdity. They dreaded a detection by it. They must alter it. But they could not supply the defect of the seal. And therefore they must retrench the subscription. They accordingly went to work very busily again. They had not many days for it. They did not discover their error, till they had presented their letters to the council on the 4th of December. The parliament was to meet on the 15th, and actually sat only to the 29th*. But they were too expert in their business, not to be expeditious in it. They wrote over the letters anew. They thus formed a THIRD edition of them. They left out all the subscriptions. And the writings, when they came to be exhibited in parliament, appeared no longer subscribed by the hand of Mary, but merely “WRITTEN WHOLLY” by it.

The acts of council and of parliament confirm the facts in this history, beyond all possibility of doubt. That unsealed state of the letters, into which the rebels were forced by necessity, accounts

* Sir Thomas Murray's Acts of Parliament, 191, and Goodall, ii. 237.

sufficiently

sufficiently for them. And this adds one more to the instances which we have had already, of the suspicious spirit of guilt in the rebels; of their jealous attention, to all the circumstances of their forgery; and of their successive improvements, upon their original draughts.

Nor was this difficult to be done. When “the
“artickle” was “proponit be the erlis, lordis,
“and uther nobill-men, quha tuik armis at Car-
“barrie-hill, upon the 15th day of Junii last by-
“past;” they themselves would naturally be appointed a committee, to draw it up, and introduce it into the house. The committee accordingly consisted of the very men, who had so lately sat in council on the letters. This is apparent from their drawing up the bill, just as the council had planned it, and even pretty nearly in the very words of the council. And they would of course be assisted in the work by James Makgill, the clerk of the parliament, or, as he was popularly called, clerk of the registry. James was deep in all the schemes of the party. He was a privy counsellor to Murray. He sat in that very council before. And he was one of the assistants to the commissioners, for the conferences at York and Westminster; and even one of the few employed, in communicating the letters privately to the English commissioners at York*. With such a clerk and such a committee, what could be the difficulty? There would be little or none,

* Goodall, ii. 109, 140, 236, 237, 370, and 381.

even with another committee and another clerk. They had certainly a copy of the act of council, before them. This was not wanted as an authority, but as a model. It might therefore be copied, by any of the counsellors. And, so copied, we may be sure it would be perfectly agreeable, to the new design of the party. That act being thus modified into a bill in the committee, it and the letters would be presented together to the whole house. On a hearing or an inspection of both, the latter would be found to accord exactly with the former, in not being subscribed by Mary, in being only written by her. None of the friends of Mary, could know any thing of the variation. It was only in the knowledge of her enemies. Should any of *these* have been inclined to notice it, either in the committee or in the house; he could not have done it, without a total inattention to his own safety. He and they were all too interested in passing a law, which was to be their own acquittal, for all their deeds of rebellion and usurpation; to oppose it by any discovery, that might be fatal to it and to themselves. And though there might be some men, not destitute of all honour, in the preceding council of Murray's; yet the powerful principle of self-preservation, would operate with all the force of villainy itself, and seal up their lips for ever.

In this manner, the act of council was transmuted into an act of parliament. In a few years, all memory of the striking variation between them, in the description of the letters, was lost.

It was still apparent indeed upon the books of the privy council. But these were accessible to few. They were accessible to none but the rebels themselves, while rebellion had its day. Afterwards the books were lost. They have long perished. Nor would any account of this act, have escaped the destruction of the whole; if that zeal, which was so much at work in exhibiting papers for the calumnation of Mary, and has been made by Providence so serviceable to the very vindication of her character, had not been usefully busy about it. At the conferences in England, as the rebels appear presenting a copy of the act of parliament to the English commissioners, so they equally presented, without appearing, a copy of the act of council too. This has happily been preserved, while the original has been lost. It was preserved in that repository of papers, which was formed by Cecil. There however it lay unnoticed and unknown, to the present times. No one was fortunate enough to see it, or critical enough to call it out into notice. A spirit of laborious inquiry is not a common talent in the world. It is particularly uncommon among those, who are best able to rectify the judgment of their cotemporaries. But a spirit of thinking, of combining different papers into one view, of collating paper with paper, and so forming a decisive inference from all, is much more uncommon still. And this pointed proof of the forgery of the letters, lay buried in dust and darkness, exposed as a single paper to a thousand accidents,
or

or lost in the obscurity of a thousand papers around it, for nearly two hundred years *.

* Mr. Goodall in 1754 first noticed it as evidence, i. 43—44. Mr. Tytler in 1760 reinforced the notice, p. 7—12, edit. i. and still more strongly, p. 7—13, edit. iii. But it had been published in 1740 by Haynes, 453—454. And see Goodall, ii. 246—247 for the act of parliament presented, and my Appendix, No. i. and ii. in answer to Dr. Robertson's ii. 367—368, edit. xi.

CHAPTER VI.

§ I.

I HAVE already pointed out three very extraordinary instances of variation, in the letters. The two first are most important. But the last is most striking. Coming luckily between the exhibition in council and the production in parliament, and so presenting itself in the light from each ; we see it in the clearest point of view. And the most resolved enemies of Mary have nothing to advance, in opposition to this glaring proof of forgery ; except by *supposing what is contrary to fact*, or by *affirming what is repugnant to common-sense*. All endeavours to darken, what is so luminous ; all attempts to muffle up this moon, which shines with so strong a lustre ; can only draw down a heavy charge of folly, upon the head of him that makes them.

But besides this ; and besides the more important alteration, which I have pointed out from Throgmorton before, when the whole mass (as it were) was thrown back into the crucible, and melted down for a re-coinage ; there are other instances of variation, which have never been noticed at all, and yet require the attention of the publick. I shall lay one of them before my reader, at present.

When

When first the letters were formed, they would as naturally be DIRECTED as subscribed. This common-sense suggests to us. The first *impression* of the letters, therefore, we may be very sure to have had these *head and tail pieces* to them. Accordingly we find the rebels upon all occasions, representing the letters in such a manner, as if they were actually *directed*. The acts of council and of parliament before, speak of them as letters “SENT BE HIR TO JAMES ERLLE BOITHWELL.” So also, in Morton’s and Murray’s enumerations of all the written evidences against the Queen, these are said expressly to have been, “SEND AND “PAST betwixt the QUEENE—and JAMES SUM- “TYME ERLLE BOTHVILE*.” In the same manner, the commissioners at York notice them without any hesitation, as addressed to Bothwell. They call them, “the Quene of Scottes lettres “WRITTEN TO BOTHAILL †.” They intimate indeed a proper doubt at times, concerning the letters being in her handwriting. But they never insinuate the slightest doubt, of their being addressed to Bothwell. Just so the commissioners at Westminster, and the privy counsellors at Hampton Court, speak of the letters as WRITTEN TO THE EARL OF BOTHWELL ‡. And Murray finally mentions, that he produced to them letters, “written be the Quenis awin hand, and SENT “TO THE SAID JAMES SUMTIME ERLE OF “BOTHVILLE §.”

* Appendix, No. iv.

† Ibid. No. vi.

‡ Ibid. No. viii. and ix.

§ Ibid. No. xi.

But whence arises all this certainty of conviction? Not from any *internal* evidence. There is nothing in any of the letters, that denotes the Earl to be the object of the adulterous love. There is even something in the *principal* of them, that denotes him *not* to be the object. He is there spoken of as a *third person*. “Remember
“zow,” it says to the real object, “of the pur-
“pois of the Lady Reres, of the Inglismen, of
“his mother, of the Erle of Argyle, of THE ERLE
“OF BOTHWELL*.” Here Bothwell is mentioned as equally a third person with Argyle, and as equally a different one from the person addressed. Yet the rebels and the commissioners, we see, are sure they were addressed to Bothwell. And this assurance of faith in them, must therefore have resulted originally, from *external* evidence concerning the point, and from the actual superscription of the letters to Bothwell.

Yet they appear at present, without any superscription at all. They are no more directed to any one, than they are subscribed by any one. Nor have they lost their directions, any more than they have lost their subscriptions, by accident, by the inaccuracy of a blundering clerk, or by the bias of a mechanical influence on the mind. They were un-directed, at their production before the commissioners in Westminster. This is plain from a cotemporary writer. The bishop of Ross, in a memorial which he presented to Elizabeth herself, and which is dated as early

* Lett. i. Sect. xxxvi. in Vol. ii.

as the 17th of December, 1568, only nine days after the production of the letters, says thus of them: "They are not subscrivit be the alledgit
 " writer theirow, nor seillit, nor signetit,—nor zit
 " DIRECT TO NA MAN *."

They were therefore most extraordinary letters, to be exhibited in evidence. They were to ground a charge against *Mary*, of murderous confederacy with *Bothwell*. Yet they were not subscribed by *Mary*. And they were not superscribed to *Bothwell*. But they were both superscribed and subscribed originally, as I have already shown. Only the same principle of cautious villainy in the rebels, that annihilated their own prior creation so decisively, that mangled their posterious one so much as we have seen, and peculiarly lopped away the subscriptions; equally applied its retrenching hand to the directions, and tore them wholly away. Letters UNSEALED, and yet (as the commissioners at York very properly say) "conteyning foule mattein, and abominable to be thought of or to be written by a
 " prince †;" could not be supposed by any but the determined enemies of *Mary*, to be either signed openly by *her*, or to be addressed openly to *him*. The simplicity of faith in a fool, would revolt equally at either. And the address to *Bothwell* was accordingly withdrawn, with the signature of *Mary*.

But then how came the letters to be spoken of afterwards, as if they were still directed to *Both-*

* Appendix, No. xii.

† Ibid. No. v.

well? From three causes. One relates to the Scotch parliament. Another points to the English commissioners. And the third mounts up to Murray himself.

The letters are never spoken of, either before or after the Scotch parliament, as actually directed to Bothwell. They are only said to be *sent* him. This indeed, in all common construction of language concerning *letters*, implies them to have been addressed, as well as dispatched, to him. Yet, as it is one of those words in every language, which in ordinary usage pass current for more than their proper signification; the rebels had no need to alter their expressions concerning this, as they had concerning the subscriptions. The act of council had asserted them to be *sent* to Earl Bothwell, when they had directions upon them. The act of parliament asserted them equally to be *sent* him, when the directions were taken away. It might properly do so. Though *not* directed, they *might* be sent to him. And whether they were sent or not, was a point which the partisans of Mary might have required to be proved, before they suffered the letters to be sanctioned for hers by a law.

But they were precluded from doing this, by the terrours that were artfully hung over their heads. They were precluded from taking a single step of this kind, from asking a single question, or from starting a single doubt; by the accursed combination that was formed among the rebels, to murder Mary in a most cruel manner, if any opposition was made by her friends to the law. Nor was
this

this a mere menace. Some of their own party, who were best capable of judging, considered the combination in so serious a light, and were so apprehensive of the consequences of it; that they would not enter into it. “Sindrie of the nobil-
 “men partakeris with thameselfis,” say Mary’s lords, “refusit to subscryve the samin, or *con-*
“sent to hir deid [death] in ony wayis.”* Murray was too determined in his aims, and too savage in his spirit, not to have set the confederacy at work upon their object, if he had been defeated in his designs for the law. Mary’s friends thought him so, and trembled for their Queen. Some of his own associates equally thought him so, and trembled lest he should involve them in the guilt of her murder.

Yet Murray must have intended, rather to menace than to murder. Even a Murray would not attempt a murder, if a menace would answer his purpose as well. His great intent was to terrify. To terrify Mary into a resignation of the crown, was the point to which all his measures ultimately tended. This was the grand scope of the present law. And to terrify her adherents in the house from being troublesome in it, from scrutinizing his proceedings with an inquisitive eye, from examining the *letters* particularly, from noticing the want of subscriptions, and from insisting on the want of directions, to them; he attacked them in their tenderest part, not by threatening *their* lives, not by banding to mur-

* Goodall, ii. 360.

der *them*, but by threatening the life of their sovereign, and by banding to murder Mary. Such an instrument of terroure as this, which was calculated only for the generous and the brave, was fabricated merely for the present emergency. It acted therefore with the greater force, upon the friends of Mary. The fate of their mistress, hung suspended on their actions and words. The blood-hounds of rebellion were “in their slips, straining upon the start,” and ready to spring upon their prey. And those worthies were compelled by their very worth, their very bravery and generosity, to act with the nicest caution, and to let the law pass un-scrutinized and un-exposed*.

Such a violent mode of passing the law, however, must have convinced them at the time, as it must equally convince my reader now, in the fullest and most effectual manner; that letters, which were to be so carried through the house, were undoubtedly spurious, had been clumsily fabricated, and might have been easily detected.

* Yet Dr. Robertson was so little apprized of these circumstances, or so little attentive to their *momentum* and force; as to urge the passing of this law, for a real argument of guilt in Mary (Diff. 22). He must either have thought a pop-gun would be artillery sufficient, to decide these long contests concerning Mary against her;

Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta,
Pulveris exigui jactu compressa quiescant:

or, in great distress for arguments, he picked up all that he could find;

—————certamine agresti,
Stipitibus duris agitur fudibusve præuistis.

But they were convinced of their spuriousness, by their appearance. “Hir Majestie’s writing
 “*producit in parliament,*” they say, could be
 no proof of murder against her, “albeit it *were*
 “her awin hand-writ, AS IT IS NOT; and als
 “the famin IS DEVYSIT BY THAMESELFIS in
 “sum principal and substantialis clausis*.” Yet
 they were obliged to acquiesce, in a merely ne-
 gative opposition to all. They merely “tuik in-
 “struments and protestatiounis,—that thay *con-*
 “*sentit* to na hurt of the Quenis Majestie’s per-
 “foun, estait royall, nor crown; *fordar nor her*
 “*Hienes wald frielie appreif herself, being at li-*
 “*bertie*: nor yet *wald voit in onie thing, concern-*
 “*ing her Grace’s honor nor lyfe* †.” So much was
 due to their own probity! But more would have
 been dangerous to their Queen’s life.

We cannot wonder then, that Mary’s adherents
 did not call for a proof of the letters being *sent*
 to Bothwell, though they were not directed to
 him. Those adherents called for no proof of
 their being written by Mary, though they were
 not subscribed by her. They called for no proof
 of any thing concerning them. The bloody
 comet, that glared continually before their eyes,
 prevented all inquiry. The letters, and the law,
 passed without particular contradiction through
 the house. And they would equally have passed
 in such circumstances, we may be sure, if the let-
 ters had been charged with absurdity, and loaded
 with forgery, in every atom of their composition.

* Goodall, ii. 361.

† Ibid. 169.

But when the letters come to be canvassed in England, then the want of a direction to Bothwell will be supplied, by a proof of their actual conveyance to him. England is a region, in which Murray's comet can have no effect, upon the spirits of the judges. Nor has it. *Yet the want is not supplied.* None of the persons that carried the letters, appeared to prove the conveyance of them. None were produced by Murray. None were called for by the English commissioners. Thus was no course of transmission showed. The defect of a direction, particularly, was left totally un-cured. Murray could not cure or show either. Nor could the commissioners call for either. The letters were not exhibited to them, as commissioners. They were shown to them only, as private gentlemen. This reason, however, was no longer in force, when the letters were exhibited again at Westminster. Some witnesses therefore will be brought up *now*, to fill this grand chasm of evidence, and to show us at least the *verbal* directions of one or more of the letters. *But they are not.* "There is neither subscription of the writer," says Bishop Lesley at the end of the Westminster conference, "nor *superscription unto whom they were directed* : "there is no mention [it should be, *no proof*] "made *of the Bearer*, who is, as it may be supposed,—the man in the moone : he was never "yet known or heard of [judicially], that *did* "either receive or deliver them*." And no ac-

* Appendix, No. xii.

count was ever given, why the letters are supposed to have been for Bothwell. They carry no directions to him. They have no conveyance to him, proved or attempted to be proved. Yet they are believed by the privy counsellors at Hampton Court, by the commissioners at York, by the commissioners at Westminster, by Murray, and by every body, to be addressed to him. How is this? Here is faith without reason, an implicit faith without a grain of reason. And whence arises it all?

It all arises from Murray. He gave the first movement to this circle of belief, which we have seen gradually widening and widening, till it spread over the island. He first believed, and he taught others to believe. But whence did *he* derive his faith? He could derive it only from one source. *He knew the original letters.* He knew them to be addressed to Bothwell. He knew them to be directed to him. And, though he found himself compelled by the necessities of policy, to deprive them of their directions; and could find nothing in the contents, that would point out the person addressed: yet he had the courage to think of supplying all, by the mere bravery of assurance; and had the good fortune to have his word taken, his assertion circulated, and his faith adopted, without a knowledge of his reasons, by all.

§ II.

SO plain a proof of forgery have we here, in this slight circumstance. Not addressed externally to Bothwell, and not addressed internally to him, the letters were yet *known* by Murray to be intended for him. And the same kind of intuitive knowledge, is observable in another circumstance, in the DATES of the letters.

Not one of the letters has a date of the year upon it. Not one of them has a date of the month. Only one has the date of the day and place. This is the second. It carries these words at the bottom of it: "From Glasgow, this Set-terday in the morning*." This is all the internal evidence that we have, concerning the times and the places, at which these remarkable letters pretended to be written. And the very omission of these natural adjuncts of a letter, throws a strong colouring of suspectability over the whole. But though *we* know no more than this, *Murray* knew a great deal more. He could tell exactly, *when* each of the letters was composed by Mary. He could point out with a ready finger, *where* each of them was dispatched to Bothwell. How shall we account for this high degree of knowledge? It is certainly wonderful. It has even something supernatural in its appearance. But *was* he possessed of any portion of that second sight, which is so peculiar to the Highlands of Scotland? Had he the hap-

* See it in vol. ii.

piness, to see THE SUN OF DRUIDISM shining out, in a bright gleam of vision upon the tops of the northern mountains, when it had been long set to the rest of the island? Or, in that more popular mythology, to which Murray and his brothers of presbyterianism must have been peculiarly attached, has he gone on so far in profligacy, as to be admitted into a compact of blood with the spirits of the deep; to have some of them attending constantly upon him, for his allotted hour; and to receive intelligence of the greatest secrets, from them? He *may* have gone on in flagitiousness long enough, I fear, to be qualified for admission into such a compact. But he had no service for his *familiars* now. He *may* have been blessed with that only blessing of the poor Highlanders at present, the gift of second-sight. But he made no use of it concerning the letters. His knowledge with regard to *them*, was all natural.

When first the artificer of forgery began to exercise his pen, in the invention of the letters; he would as certainly DATE them, as direct and subscribe them. He had even a journal drawn up, for the very purpose of dating them. This was to fix the time, and to ascertain the place, for each of the letters respectively. And the artist appears to have actually annexed, the requisite notes of both from it. This journal was presented by Murray to the commissioners at Westminster, when he presented the letters. It was the scale, by which these were graduated. Yet no mention is made of it, as delivered in by the rebels,

rebels, either by themselves or by the commissioners. It was plainly presented, however. It was found among the other papers in the Cotton library, and had been marked by the hand of Cecil himself*.

In this useful key of chronology to the letters, which has been since enlarged in order to refer back to those letters, that it was originally created to form; Murray tells us, that the *first* was written from Glasgow, as well as the second; that the *third* and *fourth* were equally written from thence, with both; and that they were all written on the 24th, 25th, or 26th of January, 1567. This is certainly very extraordinary intelligence. But let us see the journal itself. "January 21, 1566," it says of 1566-7: "The Quene tuik hir journey towards Glascow, and was accompanyit with the Erlis of Huntly and Bothwell to the Kalendar, my Lord Levistoun's place: 23; The Quene came to Glascow, and on the rode met hir Thomas Crauford from the Erle of Lennux, and Sir James Hamilton, with the rest mentionit IN HIR LETTER:—24; The Quene remaynit at Glascow, lyck as she did the 25th and the 26th, and hayd the conference with the King WHEREOF SHE WRYTTIS; and IN THIS TYME wrayt hir BYLLE," the first letter, "and UTHER LETTERIS to Bothwell †." Here we have every circumstance concerning the four first letters, detailed to us with the greatest exactness. *The very writer of the letters*

* Appendix, No. x.

† Ibid. *ibid.*

could not have known the history of them, more completely. But the apparent infallibility of our guide, does not desert him here. He can tell us with an equal minuteness of assurance, concerning the four other letters. He is even *more* particular. He now tells us the very day of the week. “April 21. viz. *Mounday*,” he says, “the Quene
 “raid to STIRLING, as it wes devysit; and FROM
 “THENCE WREYT THE LETTERIS, concerning
 “the purpose devysit of hir ravishing; quhair
 “Huntly cam to hir, and began to repent him:
 “—April 23; She came to Linlythquow—*.” This is also very particular. And indeed the whole reflects such an extraordinary lustre upon the letters, that a reader is astonished at the first view, with the broad glare of light around him; and cannot immediately recollect his scattered senses, to consider the artificial nature of it.

Murray was concerned in the fabrication of the letters. He might well therefore know so precisely as he does, all the circumstances relating to them. But the dates he knew to be upon the very letters themselves. The journal plainly refers to those dates, by its manner. It does not say, that Mary wrote the *four first* letters from Glasgow; as we are obliged to say for the sake of distinction. *We* fix the number, from a view of their contents. But the journal refers only to their dates. It therefore says, that “in this
 “tyme [she] wrayt hir bylle,” meaning her first letter, and alluding to her own appellation of it

* Appendix, No. x.

in the very letter itself; “and [her] uther letteris
 “to Bothwell,” not recounting them, but remit-
 ting the reader to their dates. And the letters
 still preserved those dates, to the conference at
 York. This is *plainly* true concerning *one* of
 them, and must therefore be true concerning *all*.
 The first letter is peculiarly noticed by the com-
 missioners there, as indeed it deserved to be.
 This has *now* not a single trace of a date upon it.
 Nor had it any at Westminster, as is clear from
 a slight intimation concerning it from the com-
 missioners there. “Thomas Crawford,” they
 notice, “was, as they” (the rebels) “said, the
 “same party of whom mention is made in a long
 “lettre—: where it is said, about the beginning
 “of the same lettre, that a gentleman of the
 “Earl of Lenox met *the party that wrote the let-*
 “*tre,*” the Queen being so mentioned, because
 there was no subscription to it; “about four
 “miles from the *place where the lettre was wryt-*
 “*ten,*” the place being so denoted, because there
 was no local date to the letter; “as in the copie
 “of the same lettre may appere*.” Yet the
 journal above asserts it expressly, to be written
 from GLASGOW. And from GLASGOW the com-
 missioners at York equally assert it to be written.
 “Imprimis,” they say in their extracts from it,
 “after lang discourse of hir conference with the
 “king hir husband in GLASGOW, sche writis to
 “the said Erle in thir [these] termes †,” &c.
 But in what they call “a breif note of the cheif

* Goodall, ii. 246.

† No. vii.

“ and principall poincts of the Queen of Scottes
 “ lettres written to Bothaill—, as farre forthe as
 “ we coulde BY THE READINGE gather * ;” they
 say thus: “ She toke her journey from Eden-
 “ burghe to GLASCO, to visit,” &c. Then “ she
 “ wrote to Bothaill from GLASCO, how she flat-
 “ tered,” &c †. They then form a large ab-
 stract of, and make large extracts from, the very
first letter. And they plainly appear from the
 easy manner in which they mention the place, as
 well as from their own assertion concerning the
 reading, to have learned the date from the letter
 itself.

In this state then, the letters remained to the
 conference at York, ALL DATED; half from Glas-
 gow, half from Stirling, the former on the 24—
 26th of January, 1567, and the latter on the 21st—
 22d of April following. But they were all, ex-
 cept one, stript of this garniture before the con-
 ference at Westminster. This is clear from a co-
 temporary memorial, which was written without
 any inspection of the letters, but founded on
 good intelligence concerning them; and was even
 presented to Elizabeth herself, on the 18th of
 December, 1568. “ They are not,” says the au-
 thour, “ subscrivit be the alledgit writer thair of,
 “ nor seilit nor signetit, and [except one] CON-
 “ TAIN NA DAIT OF ZEIR, MONETH, OR DAY,
 “ nor zit direct to na man ‡.” This is also
 plain

* Appendix, No. vi.

† Ibid. ibid.

‡ Appendix, No. xii. This remarkable memorial appears
 again in an abstract, which Cecil made of it at the time, and
 the

plain from the cotemporary memoirs of Crawford; which notice the rebels to have produced at Westminster, “some articles merely conjectural, “decrees made in a tumultuous assembly of the “estates, and some love-letters—without mentioning TIME OR PLACE *.” It is equally plain from the annals of the cotemporary Camden; in which he tells us, that “the letters—wanted “NAMES, SUBSCRIPTIONS, and DATES” to them †. They thus became at last the most monstrous letters, that ever the credulity, or the knavery, of man obtruded upon the world for evidence. And thus the letters, in the months of October and November, 1568, underwent another important alteration; and appeared in a FOURTH EDITION, corrected and abbreviated, on the 8th of December following.

When the rebels originally formed their letters and their journal, they had a good deal of past time to re-trace on their memories. By their own account, the letters were not in their hands

the title of which is, “extracted out of a writyng gyven to “the Queen’s majesty, by the bishop of Rofs, 18 December, “1568.” That part of the abstract, which relates to this often-cited passage, runs exactly in these terms: “Hir “hand, nor seale, nor date is to the letters, nor no direction “to any” (Haynes, 495). The Bishop also has repeated all again, in his Defence of Queen Marie’s Honour. “There “is neither subscription of the writer,” he says, “nor subscription unto whom they were directed: they are neither sealed nor signed; there appeareth neither date, where- “in they were dated, neither day nor moneth” (P. 18—19, Anderson, 1).

* P. 114.

† Trans. 117, Orig. 145.

before

before the 20th of June; and, in reality, were not before the 4th of December, 1567. Yet these go back in their dates, as we have already seen, to the April and January preceding. The journal even goes back, to the very June before all *. Nor was any part of it kept at the time. This is apparent, from the early mention of the letters in it. It is also apparent, from two strokes in the language of it. The son of Mary was not crowned King, and the Earl of Murray was not made Regent, as it witnesseth itself; before July 29, and August 22, 1567 †. Yet so long as April the 9th and March the 10th before, and even so long as the 19th of June in the year preceding; from the mere force of habit, and by an unperceived anticipation of the language, then current at the writing; the one is denominated King, and the other Regent. The very first article of the whole informs us, that “June 19. KING JAMES “THE SIXT was born.” Two other articles tell us, that “March 10.—at this tyme my Lord “REGENT purchaist leif to depart ‡;” and “April 9. my Lord REGENT departit furth of “Scotland §.” So plainly was the journal drawn up from end to end, by a recollection of dates and facts. So plainly also were the letters, that are mentioned in and were dated by it, not written till James was crowned, and Murray became regent; till the one had been king, and the other regent, for some time; and till the constructor of the

* Appendix, No. x.

† Ibid. ibid.

‡ Ibid. ibid.

§ Ibid. ibid.

journal, and the dater of the letters, was imperceptibly led by the established habits of conversation, to call them king and regent some months before they were. And so clearly is the origin, which I have assigned to the letters from a long train of historical evidences before, here shown at once by three accidental dashes, in the very language of the rebel journal. The journal and the letters were both drawn up together, in the end of November and beginning of December, 1567; and three or four months, after James was crowned and Murray was made regent.

The journal was naturally, at first, a short outline of facts and dates. But it was afterwards enlarged with other dates and facts, and filled up with frequent references to the letters. This however was not done, *till the conferences in England*. The language of the journal again proves the point, and in two additional strokes of its narration. On the 12th of February, 1567, it says, “Harry Killigrew arrayvit from *the Quene’s Majestie*.” On the 15th of May, 1568, it adds, “Maister Middlemoir, sent from *the Quene’s Majestie*, causit my lord from
“thencefurth absteyn from armour and violence.” Here *Elizabeth*, we see, is spoken of simply as “the Quene’s Majestie,” without any addition to restrict the title to England, and without any specification to distinguish her from the Queen of Scotland. And, as this easy and familiar mode of expression could never have been used in *Scotland*; so does the purely English quality of it, prove the journal to have been
finally

finally interpolated and extended in *England*. The rebels formed it at first for their private use, in fabricating the letters, and in modelling their other forgeries. It was to be their grand time-keeper, in realizing all the freaks of forgery, which they actually carried into execution, and all that they had probably pictured upon their imagination besides,

All the ten thousand freaks that died in thinking.

And they enlarged it at the beginning, extended it at the end, and interpolated it in the middle; for the exhibition of it to the commissioners at Westminster, for the fortifying of the letters by it, and for the prosecution of the abusive work in the letters against Mary.

But, from this late formation of it at first, the rebels might well become, as they clearly did, apprehensive that the dates in it were erroneous, after the conference at York. A violent clash with chronology, would expose them to the most imminent danger of detection. On their publick production of the letters at Westminster, the memories of many would be ransacked, notes would be consulted, and records might be appealed to; to see whether the dates would not lead to a detection. They could no longer terrify, as they had done in Scotland. Their confidence in Elizabeth, indeed, was great. But anachronisms would be too vulnerable a part, to be left in any state of exposure. Yet what could they do? They could not rectify the dates with a

certain hand, probably. They only suspected them to be false. But, at their distance from Scotland, they could not determine absolutely, what were false or what were true. They had only one resource, therefore. This they made use of. THEY TORE OFF ALL THE DATES AT ONCE, except one. With *this* they left no note of the year or of the month. And in that new state they presented them, to the commissioners at Westminster.

But why did they leave a date to the second letter, when they took it away from the rest? For this reason, I believe. The original date of the second, was accidentally what it now is, vague and loose; without any note of the month or year, without any intimation of the day of the month, and with only a mention of the day of the week, the time of the day, and the name of the place. Such a date was so indeterminate, that no mischief would be apprehended from it. It was therefore left. The harmless generality of it gained it a continuance, when the particularity of the others made them too dangerous to be kept.

But such is the ever-hazardous nature of guilt, that the rebels betrayed their forgery in every step, which they took to hide it. They put dates to their letters at first, in order to authenticate them. They were obliged to snatch them hastily away afterwards, in order to prevent a detection. They thus made a detection, by the very variation which they occasioned, in the form of the letters. And, what shows the great difficulty of

of giving a firm consistency to falsehood, they could after all mention exactly the times and the places, at which each of the letters had been written; and so detected themselves again, by the impossibility of coming to the knowledge of such circumstances, in an honest manner *.

§ III.

I HAVE now gone through a variety of alterations, which were made from time to time, in the form and substance of the evidences against Mary. But I can add one more to the list, which is even more apparent than they, and per-

* The reader, who is acquainted with the controversy already carried on upon the subject of these letters, will readily see; that I have carefully refrained from the grand point, which has been canvassed so much by Mr. Goodall, i. 118—124, Mr. Hume, v. 148—149, and Dr. Robertson, Diss. 35—40, concerning the date of the second letter being in direct contradiction, to dates authenticated by records. I must be candid enough to acknowledge, that I once intended to enter fully into it, though it was not essential to my argument; that I coincided entirely with Mr. Goodall, against Mr. Hume; and that I hoped, with the useful sanguineness of a meditating authour, to have confirmed the argument of the former for ever. I had not then read Dr. Robertson's Dissertation. But, on reading it, I was surpris'd, staggered, and converted. It seems very strange indeed, that records signed every day, or every other day, successively for weeks together, should yet carry *anticipated* dates upon them; and that even the *place* should be anticipated, as well as the day. Yet so it is. Dr. Robertson has shown it to be so. And I think myself compelled by the laws of honour, to pay this acknowledgment of justice, not silently but openly, in favour of a dissertation, which I am obliged in almost every other respect to reprobate.

haps more important too. And it is this. Those evidences were not merely varying in their substance or form. They were also changing in their very NUMBER. This is indeed an amazing circumstance. Yet it is a very clear one.

The writings are reported by the rebels themselves, to have been all found together, at one time, and in one place. Thus, in the journal which we have noticed so particularly before, it is said: "June 20. Dalglesche, chalmer-child
" [chamberlain] to my Lord Bothwell, wes takin,
" and the box and letteris which he brought out
" of the castell *." And in Murray's and Morton's receipts, the 16th of September, 1568, and the 22d of January, 1571, it is said; that this "box, and haill pecis within the samyn,
" were takin and fund with unquhile George
" Dalglesche, fervand to the said Erll Bothvile,
" upon the xx. day of Junii, the zeir of God
" 1567 zeirs †." This was Pandora's box to Mary, pregnant with all the evils of life. But then the very nature of such a discovery, precludes all possibility of addition to the evidence. It must have been in its fullest magnitude, at the very moment of the discovery. And it could not have been one atom larger, at the final production of the whole in Westminster.

Yet it did enlarge. The LETTERS were all, that the rebels pretended to have at first against her. The act of council mentions only "HIR
" PREVIE LETTRES," as the argument for the

* Appendix, No. x.

† Ibid. No. iv.

charge of murder against her. The act of parliament equally notices only “HIR PREVIE LETTERIS,” as the groundwork for the sentence of murder against her. Nothing else but the letters was produced, before either the parliament or the council. And Mary’s nobles expressly assert what was presented to the former, to have been merely the “allegit PRIVIE WRITINGIS*.” So also, when Murray on the 22d of June, 1568, delivered some notices to an agent of Elizabeth’s, in order to be reported to Elizabeth herself; he said thus: “We have already sent unto our servant Mr. Jhone Wode, that quhilk we traist fall sufficientlie resolve hir Majestie of any thing, scho standis doubtful unto.” But what was this? He tells us himself. It was “sic LETTERIS as we haif of the Quene, our foverane lordis mother, that sufficientlie, in our opinioun, preivis hir consenting to the murthure of the king, hir lauchful husband †.” He has yet nothing more than the letters, to produce against her. And accordingly the journal itself speaks only of “the box and LETTERS,” as taken on the 20th of June, 1567. So far therefore, as late as the end of the journal, which is May 15, 1568; and even still later, below the 22d of June following; the whole evidence against Mary, by the confession of the rebels themselves, was comprised singly in the letters. For ONE WHOLE YEAR, they pretended not to find any thing in the box, except letters. Yet, with an astonishing

* Goodall, ii. 361.

† Appendix, No. iii.

hardiness of front, they afterwards altered their tone. They pretended to find fresh evidences there. These had lain all the time unperceived. The approaching conference in England, made them search the box again. And they now drew forth, some valuable additions to their former papers.

They thus found for the first time those SONNETS, which my preface has announced so long ago, and which my reader, I suppose, has been so frequently expecting to appear since. These now appeared at last. The 16th of September, 1568, is the day of their exhibition to us, nearly FIFTEEN MONTHS after the first discovery of the box. *Then* the rebels could remember those circumstances relative to the discovery of the box, which they had forgotten before the privy council and parliament, the December preceding. They could even remember still more of them about three years afterward, and when the English edition of the Detection was published, in November, 1571. Thus the fun of memory was warmest, as it was declining most from its meridian. In the same manner the sonnets were discovered, fifteen months after the discovery of the box. They are *then* mentioned, as a part of its original contents. They are *then* delivered up by the Earl of Morton, who was the pretended seizer of the box, to the Earl of Murray, who was preparing for the conference at York. And they are thus mentioned in the receipt, which the latter with a solemn hypocrisy gave to the former, in acknowledgment of this important deposit.

He

He had received, he says, “ane silver box ower-
 “gilt [overgilt] with gold, with all missive let-
 “teris,—SONETTIS OR LUIF-BALLETTIS,—CON-
 “tenit thairin *.” The sonnets were accord-
 ingly produced at York. They are thus men-
 tioned by the commissioners there. Murray, they
 say, produced some letters with “diverse fond
 “BALLADES of hir,” Mary’s, “own hand; which
 “letters, BALLADES,—weare closed in a little
 “coffer of silver and gilte, heretofore geaven by
 “her to Bothwell †.” They were re-produced
 afterwards with the letters at Westminster, and
 placed in order before them, though they have
 been generally printed after them since. “The
 “tenors of all which writings,” says the journal
 of the commissioners concerning them and the
 letters, “hereafter follow in order; THE FIRST
 “BEING IN MANNER OF A SONNET ‡.” And
 they were finally produced with the letters before
 the privy council, a few days afterwards; being
 noticed in the journal of the council, as “letters
 “supposed to be written by the Quene of Scots
 “own hand to the Erle Bothwell, and therewith
 “also ONE LONG SONNET §.”

This was certainly a grand addition, to the ori-
 ginal stock of evidence. Fabricated in the month
 of September, 1568, the sonnets were plainly cal-
 culated to co-operate with the letters, in impres-
 sing more and more strongly upon the minds of
 the English commissioners, the idea of Mary’s

* Appendix, No. iv.

† Ibid. No. viii.

‡ Ibid. No. v.

§ Ibid. No. viii.

violence of affection for Bothwell. The rebels accordingly produced them at Westminster, expressly with the view of showing, in concert with the letters, “her INORDINATE LOVE towards the
 “said Erle Bothwell *.” And this end of their creation they appear to have answered completely. The commissioners at York particularly, who not only relate the facts, but also express their feelings upon them, appear to have been struck with the gross affection, so openly displayed upon the letters and ballads. This they express in strong terms. And “the said letters and ballades,” they observe, “do discover such inordinate love
 “between her and Bothwell, her lothfomeness
 “[loathing] and abhorringe of her husband that
 “was murdered, in such sorte; as everie good
 “and godlie man, can not but detest and abhorre
 “the same †.”

Nor were the sonnets *all* the additions, that were *then* made to the original evidence. Men, who have it in their power to recur to forgeries for assistance at every turn, will be sure to recur to them in any pressing moment of distress. They have an ample fund of resources in themselves. They have a treasure that can never be exhausted. And they will be apt to draw upon it, with the greatest freedom. Accordingly, at the same distance of fifteen months from the first seizure of the box and letters, and at the same period of time with the first discovery of the sonnets; the rebels found some other papers, lying equally un-

* Appendix, No. viii.

† Ibid. No. v.

noticed at the bottom of this little coffer. These make their first appearance with the sonnets, on the 16th of September, 1568. They thus came equally opportune with them, for the conference at York, which began the 4th of October following. Murray appears arming himself for the battle there. And, among other his habiliments of war, we find him furnished with the letters, with the sonnets, and with some MARRIAGE-CONTRACTS. These were matrimonial agreements betwixt Mary and Bothwell. One of them is very short. But, like the letters, it pretends to be written wholly with her own hand. And, as the letters too did once, it pretends to be also subscribed by her. In it, Mary promises to take Bothwell for her husband. The other is long. It is a reciprocal engagement. It is therefore signed by both, “and before thir [these] witnesses, George Erle of Huntly, and Maister Thomas Hepburne, persoun of Aulhamstock, &c *.” And the rebels averred afterwards, that Huntly was the *writer* of the contract, as well as a witness to it †. Both these now made their appearance, FOR THE FIRST TIME. Never noticed in the act of council, or in the act of parliament, they are equally unnoticed by Murray, in his address to Elizabeth through her agent. They are first mentioned in Murray’s receipt for the box and its contents, when he was preparing to set off for York. He then acknowledges to have “all missive letteris, CONTRACTIS OR

* See iii. 4. 2.

† Goodall, ii. 92.

“OBLIGATIONIS FOR MARIAGE, sonettis or
 “*luif-ballettis*,—*contentit thairin* *.” These con-
 tracts were shewed to the commissioners at York,
 accordingly. They notice both. “There was
 “a contract shewed unto us,” they say, “signed
 “with the Quene’s hand, and also with Both-
 “well’s, bearing date the 5th of Aprill; written,
 “as it is said, with the Earl of Huntley’s own
 “hand, who, with one Thomas Hebourne,
 “weare the only witneses to the same: which
 “contract beareth date, before Bothwell’s purga-
 “tion of the murder.” “There was also,” they
 add, “a contract shewed unto us, of the Quene’s
 “own hand, of the marriage to be had between
 “her and Bothwell, bearing no date †.” They
 were equally produced again at Westminster.
 There the commissioners say, that they received
 from the rebels “certain lettres and sonnets,—
 “and *other wrytings* also ‡.” Two of these
 “other writings,” we know to have been the
 contracts: because, among the papers laid after-
 wards before the privy council, was “a promise
 “of marriage in the name of the said Quene with
 “the Erle Bothwell;” and also “the original
 “writing, supposed to be written by the Erle of
 “Huntley, being a contract of marriage betwixt
 “the Quene and the Erle Bothwell, dated at
 “Seaton the 5th of Aprill, and subscribed by the
 “Quene and the Erle Bothwell §.” And we
 equally know both to have been presented, from

* Appendix, No. iv.

† Ibid. No. v.

‡ Ibid. No. viii.

§ Ibid. No. ix.

Murray's own account of his conduct on that occasion. "We producit," he says,—“letteris,
 “—written be the Quenis awin hand, and sent
 “to—James sumtime Erle of Bothville; Item,
 “a little contract or obligatioun, written be the
 “said Quenis awin hand, promising to marry the
 “said Bothville; Item, an uther contract, writ-
 “ten by the Erle of Huntlie's hand, of the date
 “the v. of Aprill 1567 *.”

Thus were the contracts framed, together with the sonnets, and long after the letters. They were “twinned at one birth” with the former. They were born for one purpose with both. They were to co-operate with both, in carrying on the intimacies of adultery to the highest pitch. They were to ripen them, into formal engagements of marriage. And they were thus to hold out the furnished murder to us, as at once the effect of the adultery, and the cause of the contracts. But they were both founded on a real engagement. This was well known. It was a very publick one. It was subscribed by Mary and Bothwell, in the presence of many of her nobles. It was then registered in the books of council and of session. And the original is still preserved in the royal archives of Scotland. This is dated the 14th of May, 1567 †. *Then* Mary had been seized by Bothwell, carried to his castle of Dunbar, and even RAVISHED by him there. In this situation, she might well enter into a matrimonial engagement with him. Marriage then seemed

* Appendix, No. xi.

† See iii. 4. 2.

the only refuge for her honour. Yet, *for that very reason*, the rebels formed two others, the principal and the dated one of an *earlier* period; and made George Earl of Huntly, who was one of the witnesses to the former, a witness to, and the very writer of, the present. But the counterfeit could only have passed upon the world, while the genuine was unknown. The moment this was fetched out of its repository in the archives by Mr. Goodall, that was detected. The borrowed lustre of the moon, sunk away before the rising sun *.

As to the smaller and un-dated contract, this is still more plainly a forgery of the rebels. It is expressly averred above by the commissioners at York, to have been “of the Quene’s own hand,” and by Murray himself to have been “*written* be the said Quenis awin hand;” while the other is asserted to have been “*signed* with the Quene’s hand, and also with Bothwell’s,” but “*written*—with the Earl of Huntley’s own hand.” We have here, therefore, a peculiar evidence of forgery. This little contract, from some extraordinary but unknown circumstances in its history, is *the only one of all these attributed writings, that was not published in the Detection of Buchanan*, being first printed by Mr. Goodall in 1754; what is more surprising, is *the only one of all these attributed writings, that was left at London in the original* by the rebels; and, what is more surprising than either, is *the only one of all*

* See iii. 4. 2.

these attributed writings, that remains in the original at present. It remains in the Cotton library, *Caligula*, C. 1. fol. 202. From that original Mr. Goodall published it. AND THAT IS APPARENTLY NOT WRITTEN BY THE QUEEN'S HAND. This is a full proof of the general forgery. It is a proof addressed to the very senses. The *subscription* of it is in a different hand, from the *contract* itself. It is also different from Mary's hand. The letters of it, in general, carry no great resemblance to the writing of Mary. The first letter, in particular, is entirely different. In all the genuine subscriptions of her name, the first letter is constantly of the same length with the rest; while, in the bastard subscription before us, it is *twice* as long as they. And, what crowns the whole, the contract itself, which is asserted by Murray, and asserted by the commissioners, to have been written with the Queen's own hand; is actually written in one totally different, in the formal hand of a lawyer, and in a kind of chancery hand. So palpably gross is the forgery here *!

Yet let me add another remark. When this contract was shown at York, it was certainly writ-

* See iii. 4. 2, and Goodall, i. 126. So also says Ruddiman in his notes upon Buchanan's Hist. xix. 462. "Quem
"autem hic contractum," he tells us, "a Regina manu
"scriptum asseverat Buchananus, *aliâ manu ex diversâ lite-*
"rarum formâ et modulo exaratum contendit David Crafordius,
"qui cum cum aliis genuinis Reginae scriptis composuit. Vide
"acta publica ac literas ab ipso collectas in Biblioth. Jurid.
"Confer etiam appendicem ad Anglicam Detectionis et Ac-
"tionis in Mariam interpretationem, Pag. 1."

ten in the *same* hand, in which it was *subscribed*. This is plain from the account of it, given equally by the commissioners and by Murray. But when it was exhibited to Cecil, and lodged among his papers now in the Cotton library, it was very different. Cecil's contract is written in one hand, and subscribed in another. So far Cecil's contract *pretends* not to be written in the Queen's hand, though the contract of the commissioners and the contract of Murray does. *That* pretends only to be *subscribed* by Mary, when *this* pretends to be *written* by her. They are therefore not the same. The contract shown at York, and reported by Murray, has been suppressed. Another has been formed upon another plan, and yet given to Cecil as the same. This demonstrates the forgery again, in the fullest manner. And, to mark still more the confusedness of guilt in Murray, he exhibited a contract all written in the Queen's hand at York, changed it afterwards into a contract only subscribed by her, presented the latter to Cecil, and still says he presented the former to him.

But was not the assumption of Lord Huntly's name, as a witness to one of these counterfeits, and even as the very writer of it; a most extraordinary circumstance, *if* the whole was forged? The whole was certainly forged. The actual appearance of the real contract, and the late production of the mimick one; the appearance also of another contract, as all written by Mary's hand, and its re-appearance, as only subscribed by her; concur decisively to prove it a forgery. The use of Huntly's name, therefore, *was* a most extraordinary circum-

circumstance. He was then alive. He was then warm against the rebels. He was full of loyalty and spirit. And would not such a man as this, exult in exposing the impudence of falsehood in the rebels, and glory in blasting their reputation by proclaiming their forgery? He certainly would. Yet he did not. In the beginning of the year 1569, appeared what is called “the protestatioun of the Erlis of Huntly and Argyll, touching the murthour of the King of Scottis.” In this, Argyle and Huntly are seen producing some very violent presumptions against Murray and Lethington, of their guiltiness in the murder; and making this very pointed conclusion from the whole, against them: “We judge in our consciences, and haldis for certane and treuth, that the saidis Erle of Murray and Secretarie Lethingtoun wer auctoris, inventaris, devyseris, counfallouris, and causeris of the said murthour, in quhat manner or be quhatsumever persounis the samin was execute*.” And “was not this also the time,” says Mr. Hume, “for Huntly to deny his writing [and witnessing] Mary’s contract with Bothwell, if that paper had been a forgery †?” It certainly was the properest of all times. Only we should be certain also, that he actually DREW UP the protestation; and that, when he did it, he actually KNEW of the writing and testimony, thus attributed to him by the rebels. These two circumstances must be ascertained, before we can expect him to deny. Mr. Hume

* Goodall, ii. 320.

† Hist. v. 151.

indeed has taken it for granted that Huntly knew,—because he himself knows. On the same principle, many a spectator in the playhouse is astonished, that the persons moving before him do not act very differently from what they do, by availing themselves of all that insight into characters and incidents, which he himself enjoys. And in fact the Earl of Huntly, *when* he drew up the protestation, was as little apprized of the contract affirmed by the rebels to be written and witnessed by him, as he was of the power of gravitation, or the motion of the fixed stars. He *did not draw up the protestation at all*. It was composed by Lord Boyd and the Bishop of Ross, of whom the former had just come to Mary; was immediately sent by her to the Earls Huntly and Argyle, for their seals and subscriptions; and was intercepted on the way, remitted to Cecil, and so lodged among Cecil's papers, in the state in which it now appears, un-sealed, un-subscribed, and un-dated in month, day, or place*.

“Ze fall reffave,” says Mary in a covering dispatch to Huntly of the 5th of January 1569, “one letter be this beirar, to be subscryvit be zou, and our coufigne the Erle of Argyle.” It “is maid be my Lord Boyd's adwyse,” she adds, “conform to the declaratioun ze maid to our traist [trusty] counfallour the Bishop of Ross, he knawing zour deliberatioun and will thairin-till.” It was therefore drawn up by Lord Boyd, from the minutes of

* Goodall, ii. 321. It is but fair to acknowledge, that Dr. Robertson in Diss. 7—9 first taught me to see this fact, in opposition to the friends of Mary.

a conversation, which the earls had reported formally to the bishop; and in consequence of an agreement then made betwixt him and them, that they would authenticate the particulars, and assert their inference from them, whenever it was thought expedient for the honour of Mary. But, as she subjoins, “we refer to your discretiounis
 “to eik and pair the said letter, as ze fall think
 “best, and extend it in sic form, as ze fall think
 “maist neccessare: praying you to send us the
 “samin agane, subscribed and seillit, the soonest ze
 “may; to the effect it may be producit, togid-
 “der with the rest of the accusatiounis, quhilk
 “we intend to give in aganis [against] our tra-
 “touris *.” Mary sent it, for their seals and subscriptions; authorized them to lengthen or shorten it previously, as they thought requisite; and desired to have it returned, with all expedition: that she might produce it with some other proofs, to the commissioners at Westminster; in order to

* Goodall, ii. 315 and 316. The protestation, and the covering letter, are both in the same hand-writing; which is different from Mary’s (Diff. 9), and is, no doubt, that of Lord Boyd. Only, the letter is *subscribed* by Mary (Diff. 9). And Dr. Robertson assigns this reason for the letter being only subscribed, and not written also, by Mary; that “she
 “seldom chose to write in the English language” (Diff. 9). The fact is as untrue, as the reason is ridiculous. She appears frequently writing letters in English (Haynes, 376, &c.). She actually appears writing in *English*, to her embassadour in *France* itself (Keith, pref. vii—viii); and to her agents, Englefield, Morgan, and Paget, in *France* and *Spain* (Murdin, 469, 514, 515, 519, 531, and 532. And the true reason for her only signing the covering dispatch, was obviously this; that it and the protestation had been written ready for her by Lord Boyd, and that she had nothing more to do, than to sign the one and to send off both.

substantiate the charge, which she had brought against Murray and his associates, of being, as they plainly were, the very authours of the murder, that they had the audacity to charge upon her. Murray, accordingly, expected the protestation to be shown in London against him, after he was gone for Scotland. He was within five days of his departure, when the paper came into Cecil's hands. He sat down on the 19th of January, 1569, to reply to it before it was published. "Because," he says, "the custume of
 " my adversaris is, and has bene, rather to calumpniate and backbite me in my absence,
 " than befoir my face ; and that it may happen
 " thame, quhen I am departit furth of this
 " realme, sclanderouslie and untrewlie to report
 " untreuthis of me, and namelie towards sum
 " spechis haldin in my hearing at Craigmillar,
 " in the moneth of November, 1566," about three months before the murder ; for this reason he replies to the protestation. He replies to it, as if already sanctioned by the earls. And Cecil, with whom the reply was left, indorses it in form, as " an answer of the Erle of Murray, to a wryting of the Erle of Huntly and
 " Argyle *."

But

* It is remarkable, that the conversation alluded to by Huntly and Argyle, is stated by them to have been held "in
 " the zeir of God 1566 zeiris, *in the moneth of December or*
 " *thairby*" (Goodall, ii. 317). Yet Murray himself states it to have happened, "in the moneth of November, 1566" (Goodall, ii. 321). He knew the conversation so exactly, we see, that he could instantly and at once ascertain the

period

But in this answer does he, with Mr. Hume, ask Lord Huntly, why he did not deny his writing and witnessing the contract? Let us see. The accusation from the earls, naturally comes first. Yet he plainly replies to this, with all the movements of a detected villain,

With all the forc'd pace of a shuffling nag.

He is bold in denying—*what is not asserted*, concerning subscriptions and bands. But to the conversation asserted, he answers in the most evasive manner. “In cais ony man will say and “affirm,” he says, “that ever I was present quhen “ony purposis wer haldin at Craigmillar in my “audience;” NOT, as he would have answered if he had been innocent, *such or of such a nature as are stated in the protestation*; but “tending to ony “unlauchful or dishonorabill end;” then he denies it. He goes off from the *reality* of the fact asserted against him, and is ready to discuss with the earls the *quality* and *tendency* of it. He does not dare to deny the conversation stated, either in the matter or in the manner. He in-

period of it, even *better* than those peers themselves. This single circumstance serves of itself, to mark the general truth of Huntly's and Argyle's suggestion, and the general guilt of Murray in it. So a cunning Friar in Shakespeare, one well read in human nature, tries and tests the innocence of the accused lady; by putting a question to her, instantly upon her recovery from that fainting-fit, into which the accusation had thrown her.

Lady, WHAT man is he you are accused of, he asks; when no man had been specified, and when only her guilt, if she had been guilty, could have suggested the name to her.

deed acknowledges it in effect. And it certainly carries, as Mary thought it would carry, a very damnatory aspect against him. But it carries a ten times more damnatory one, from the authority which he has stamped upon it, by the evasiveness and the frivolousness of his reply. And thus that infamous addition of injury to the imprisonment of Mary, which shows Elizabeth, not merely to have confined her person, but to have also *intercepted her letters*; and that infamous addition of evidence for the conspiracy between Elizabeth and Murray, which proves Elizabeth, not only to have precluded all possibility of Mary's defending herself against Murray's accusations of murder, but to have equally precluded her from *fixing the murder upon Murray*, by intercepting *her formal dispatches for that purpose*; all has now turned out eventually, to the ampler vindication of Mary's innocence, and to the fuller attestation of Murray's and Elizabeth's guilt.

Murray, however, gives us another reply to the charges in the protestation. This *must* be satisfactory. *He had confessed the whole truth*, he says, *to Elizabeth*; a proper confessor for such a confessional! "I have alreddie declarit to the Quene's Majestie," he tells us, "the effect of the haill purposis spokin in my audience at the samin tyme, sincerely and trewlie, as I will answer to Almychtie God; unconceiling ony part to my remembrance, as hir Hienes, I traist, will report*." The publick is put

* Goodall, ii. 321—322.

off with an elufory answer; that however, to the confufion of Murray, tells all which he wants to hide. But Elizabeth is indulged with a full account. The publick was not likely to *ſhrive* him ſo gently, as ſhe would. She was ſelected for this good work, on the ſame principle that the Jeſuits were lately ſelected by all the popiſh ſovereigns in Europe, from the happy laxity of her ſentiments and morals. He could be explicit in his auricular diſcloſures to her. And ſhe was very ready, no doubt, to adminiſter ghofly comfort to him, and to give him a plenary abſolution. Father Gerard and Kitty Cadiere at Thoulon in 1731, eaſily ſettled the ritual of their confeſſions and abſolutions together.

This is the whole of his answer. He therefore does not take up Mr. Hume's objection, and expreſs his wonder at Huntly's ſilence concerning the contract. He knew indeed, though Mr. Hume did not; that Huntly had no other concern in the proteſtation, than, in concert with the Earl of Argyle; to furniſh thoſe particulars of a very remarkable converſation, which conſtitute the body of it. Theſe muſt have been furniſhed to the biſhop of Roſs, when he was laſt in Scotland; when he was appointed a commiſſioner there, by the Lords of Mary's party on Sept. 12, 1568*; and, conſequently, when the contracts had not hitherto made their appearance at all.

Yet ſtill Mr. Hume's queſtion recurs, and is only to be applied to a different perſon. And

* Goodall, ii. 351—353.

“ was not this the time,” let *me* ask in his name,
“ for Mary’s commissioners, the bishop and Lord
“ Boyd, to make Huntly deny his writing [and
“ witnessing] her contract with Bothwell, if that
“ paper had been a forgery?” It certainly was.
But still why does not Murray ask the question
himself, in his reply before? For this plain
reason, because he was aware that Mary and her
commissioners knew as little of the contract, the
witnessing, or the writing, as Huntly himself.
Neither she nor they, at the time, *knew of any thing*
except the letters. This is very remarkable. It
ought to be particularly noticed, as a circum-
stance singularly striking, even amidst all the
singularities of this strangely conducted accusa-
tion. The commissioners of Mary, who from
their residence in London, as well as their em-
ployment there, were the regular channels of in-
telligence to her; but who could not convey
what they had never received; were not only
precluded from all inspection of the original
writings adduced against her, were not only de-
barred from all copies of them, but did not even
hear, either by publick report or by secret com-
munication, of these writings being any thing
more than the letters. “ My maistres,” says the
very bishop himself, in his often-cited memorial
of the 17th of December, 1568, “ does affirm
“ constantlie, fcho never did write ony sic LET-
“ TERIS as are alledgit, but the saymin are forgit
“ and maid expresse be hir adversaries.” These
he afterwards calls, “ the alledgit writingis in
“ form

“ form of MISSIVE LETTERS OR EPISTLES *.”
 But the same bishop, who was the head and hand of the whole commission, did afterwards with a fidelity, a firmness, and a zeal, that must do him great honour in the eyes of an honest and a discerning publick †; print a vindication of his injured mistress in London, at the beginning of the year 1570; and, on its being suppressed by the tyrannous policy of Elizabeth, did afterwards reprint it at Liege in Brabant, with additions and corrections, in 1571 ‡. In this he speaks, just as he spoke in his memorial before. “ They pretend,” he says, “ certaine LETTERS, that they furnise and would have to have bene written by her Grace, whereby they seeke to inferre against her many a presumption §.” “ They say,” he adds, “ that they have a sufficient prouf to justifie the chiefest part of their accusation.—This, this is their joly witnesse.—And soothly this witnesse yet,—what else is it but a blind and deaf, and a domme, testimonie of certaine obscure LETTERS ?—It is, forsooth, a box of LETTERS taken from one Douglish,—which LETTERS he received at Edenborough of one Sir James Balfoure ||.” “ Neverthelesse,” he subjoins, “ when you have taken your best advantage you can of them, such kinde of

* Goodall, ii. 388 and 389.

† Yet Dr. Robertson pronounces him “ a man heated with faction.” Diff. 6.

‡ Appendix, No. xii.

§ Defence of Queen Marie's Honour, Anderson, i. 4.

|| P. 15 and 16.

“LETTERS MISSIVE AND EPISTLES,—are not
 “able in any-wise to make a lawful presumption,
 “much lesse any good and substantial proufe,
 “not only against your Soveraigne and Prince,
 “but not so muche as against the poorest wo-
 “man, or simplest wretched creature, in all Scot-
 “land *.” “And thinke you nowe, you most un-
 “grate and unthankful subjectes, that ye maye
 “lawefullye take armes against your mistresse
 “and your most benigne Queene; that ye maye
 “caste her into vile prison, and spoyle her of her
 “croune, and (whiche is more) of her good
 “and honourable name, fame, and estimation;
 “and then bleare mennes eies, and face the world
 “out, with the shew of these LETTERS, as it
 “were with a carde of ten? But yet, say you,
 “they are her LETTERS. She denieth them,
 “and we denie them too †.” “Think ye, that
 “wise and expert men are ignorant, how peri-
 “lous and dangerous a matter it is, to suffer any
 “good proufe upon illation of LETTERS;—but
 “who conferred these LETTERS, I pray you, with
 “your Queene’s own hande-writing?—As though
 “these counterfeit LETTERS, were not the under-
 “propped postes and upholders of your whole
 “treachery and usurped kingdome; as though
 “that many in Scotlande could not expresse, and
 “resemble, and counterfeit, in their writings, the
 “Queene’s very character; and as though there
 “were not among yourselves some singuler ar-
 “tificer in this handy-craft, and that hath sent

* P. 17 and 18.

† P. 18.

“LETTERS also in her very name, as wel into
 “Englande, as to other places bysides, without
 “either her commaundement or knowledge*.”
 Even so late as the second publication of this
 spirited address, when the conference at West-
 minster had been over for years; does the bishop
 appear totally ignorant of any other hand-writing
 being produced, besides Mary’s, and totally ig-
 norant of any other papers, except the letters.
 The sonnets, and the contracts, were wholly un-
 known to him. The contracts were equally un-
 known also, to those two very valuable and intel-
 ligent writers, the cotemporary authour of Craw-
 ford’s memoirs, and the cotemporary composer
 of Elizabeth’s annals †. And we may therefore
 rest in the fullest assurance of conviction, that
 both were unknown to Mary, Lord Boyd, and
 the bishop, on the 5th of January, 1569; when
 she sent that protestation to Huntly, which Boyd
 had written from the bishop’s minutes.

The contracts and the sonnets then, the very
 existence of which remained unknown for ever to
 Mary and to Mary’s commissioners, were forged
 by the rebels in the month of September, 1568;
 more than nine whole months, after the forgery
 of the letters. They were to support the adul-
 terous evidence of the letters, in England. The
 others had been sufficient in Scotland, with the
 fulminated anathema of the murder of Mary, an-

* P. 19 and 20.

† Crawford, 114, mentions only “love-letters and verses,”
 as presented, and Camden, 17 Transf. 144 Orig. i. speaks
 only of “letters and verses,” “epistolas et carmina.”

nexed to them. This anathema could operate only in Scotland. Even there, as the Queen was out of the hands of the rebels, it would be merely a *Brutum Fulmen* at present. Murray must therefore contrive some engine of power, to supply its place. In the clear element of England, no terrour of turbulence could operate. His terrour there must be art. And his forged papers must be his formidable weapons. He accordingly increased their number. He drew forth some new arms, from his inexhaustible magazines of artillery. These had never been seen before. Their operation would accordingly be more powerful. They would act upon the fears of Mary, just as the canons of Europe did upon the Indians, at the first invasion of America.

The rebels thus entered upon a new system of variations. They have been hitherto employed, in retrenching the superfluities of their original evidence, in paring off the dangerous excrescencies and in reducing the whole into a soberer compass. But we now see them busy, in enlarging their original evidences, in multiplying the parts that compose it, and in superadding new writings to the old. Nor let this be thought by the hasty briskness of inexperience, an inconsistency in my account of their conduct. It is none. My account is plainly founded upon facts. The inconsistency, therefore, would not be in me, but in them. Yet there is none in either. Their conduct, however varying, was uniformly the same. It flowed from the same source. It was the
the

the same current, tending to the same point, and only seeking it by another direction. It was the same principle of conscious and cautious villainy, which I have noticed so often before. This was perpetually sensible of its danger, and apprehensive of a detection. This was, for that reason, perpetually warding off the one, and guarding against the other. And it necessarily varied its wards, with its sense of the danger; and shifted its guard, with its apprehensions of detection. In their eagerness to criminate Mary at first, the rebels had passed all the lines and limits of discretion. Theirs was very strikingly the

Vaulting ambition, that o'er-leaps itself,
And falls on t'other side.

They soon saw this. They corrected themselves. They new-formed the letters. These had still some relics of their original excess, about them. They pruned them away with a careful hand. Yet the necessity of contraction had now begun to be counterpoised in their thoughts, with another necessity for enlarging. At this instant both were in the scales. Sometimes the one preponderated, and sometimes the other. They took away the subscriptions and directions, in December, 1567. They added the contracts and sonnets, in September following. And they tore off the dates, in the November afterwards. So equally mingled in their souls at this period, were the fears of deficiency and the apprehensions of exuberance! So very busy do they now appear, in sometimes turning to those, and in sometimes
listening

listening to these! They are reducing the exuberance. They are supplying the deficiency. They are forming sonnets and contracts. They actually present them to the commissioners. Yet they think it prudent afterwards, to conceal all knowledge even of their existence, from Mary's commissioners. And they are once more betraying the villainy, which they are so anxious to conceal; by the different attitudes, in which the ever-restless genius of guilt is thus exhibiting them, to the eyes of the world.

§ IV.

BUT this principle carried a still greater consequence, with it. Not merely sonnets and contracts were subjoined to the original letters. The very LETTERS themselves, were VARIED IN THEIR NUMBER. They were in some measure *letters from the moon*. They partook of the qualities of their native planet. They presented different *phases* at different times. And they successively *increased* and *diminished* in their size.

When they were first produced before the parliament and council in Scotland, they were “DIVERS hir previe lettres*.” They were therefore FOUR or FIVE at least. When they were produced at York, they were actually FIVE. “It appeared—unto us,” say the commissioners there, “by two letters of her awne hand, that,” &c.†. They afterwards form an abstract of, and make extracts from, THREE others. “Impri-

* Appendix, No. i. and ii.

† Ibid. No. v.

“mis,”

“ mis,” they say, “ after lang discourse of hir
 “ conference with the king hir husband in Glas-
 “ cow, sche wredits to the said Erle,” Bothwell,
 “ in thir [these] termes.” They then say thus :
 “ Item, in ANE UTH^R LETTRE sent be Betoun,”
 &c. And they add, “ Item, in ANE UTH^R LET-
 “ TRE,” &c *. Here therefore are five letters
 exhibited at York. But the number produced
 afterwards, and printed since, was and is EIGHT.
 “ We producit,” says Murray himself, “ Eight
 “ letteris,—writtin be the Quenis awin hand, and
 “ sent to—James sumtime Erle of Bothville †.”
 Where then are the other THREE at present ?
 Are they not yet *discovered* ? But the letters, in
 general, have now been discovered fifteen months.
 The very sonnets and contracts, that were *below*
 the letters, and there lay hid for so many months,
 have been recently discovered. And do the
 three remaining letters lie still lower in the box,
under the contracts and sonnets ; and so escape
 the notice of the rebels ?

If there they are, they still escape it. The
 conference at Westminster takes place immedi-
 ately. Murray appears with his contracts, son-
 nets, and letters. But are his letters only five
 still ? They are still five only. This is clear
 from a strict consideration, of what the commis-
 sioners and privy counsellors say concerning them.
 The rebels “ produced,” say the former, “ SE-
 “ VEN several wrytings written in *French*,—which
 “ SEVEN wrytings, being copied, were read in

* Appendix, No. vii.

† Ibid. No. xi.

“ *French*,

“*French*,—the tenors of all which SEVEN wrytings
 “ hereafter follow in order, the *first being in man-*
 “ *ner of a sonnet* *.” But of what, besides the
 sonnet, did these seven writings in French consist?
 They consisted, says the privy council, of “*sun-*
 “ *dry LETTRES*, written in *French*,—and ther-
 “ with also one long *sonnet*, and a *promise of mar-*
 “ *riage* in the name of the—*Quene* with the
 “ *saïd Erle Bothwell* †.” These indeed were
 all, that were written in *French*. There could
 therefore be no more of them. And as the French
 promise of marriage, and the French sonnets, here
 considered as one sonnet, made two out of the
 seven writings; the letters must have formed the
 other five.

FIVE then was the whole number of the pre-
 sent letters, at York and at Westminster. Yet
 eight were published afterwards. And eight
 were produced by Murray. But they were not
 produced at the time. This is plain, from the
 united testimonies of the privy counsellors and
 the commissioners. They were therefore pro-
 duced afterwards. They were produced within
 nine months afterwards. They even appear
 from Murray himself, to have been produced
 before the departure of him and his associates for
 Scotland. On the 15th of October, 1569, Mur-
 ray delivered some instructions to an embassa-
 dour whom he sent to Elizabeth, and gave him
 a general, but large, account of his own pro-
 ceedings with her commissioners before. He

* Appendix, No. viii.

† Ibid. No. ix.

therefore

therefore informed him, concerning the papers under Mary's hand; that he *then* "producit *eight* " letteris in French, written be the—Quenis awin " hand,—Item, a little contract, or obligatioun, " written be the said Quenis awin hand." He strangely forgets the sonnets. But he afterwards adds this observation: "the copies of *all* quhilk " letteris—wer deliverit to Mr. Secretary, in " quhais handis thay remane." And he then subjoins this assertion: "after quhilk probatioun " led, the saidis commissiouneris for the Quenis " Majestie of England, allowed of our proceed- " ingis;—and hereupon we returnit into Scot- " land*." The three letters behind, were put into the hands of Cecil; before Murray left London, and before the 24th of January 1569.

He was willing to complete his exhibited evidence, previous to his departure. For that reason, he went to search the box once more. He darted his eagle's eyes into the inside of it. He thrust his eagle's talons to the bottom of it. The circumstance of its being the last examination, peculiarly sharpened both. And he fastened upon no less than THREE French letters there, that had hitherto lain unnoticed. These he dragged forth with great eagerness. These he carried to the honest Cecil. He left copies with him. But he brought back the originals. He re-placed them in their snug repository again. The number of the letters in French, was at last

* Goodall, ii. 87 and 88.

completed. And they were now produced, just as they were published, eight in all.

By such slow degrees, was the written testimony against Mary finally consummated. Nine months are required, to form the constituent parts of a man. But twice nine were necessary, to form the whole of these extraordinary evidences.

Yet, what is perhaps more wonderful still, there were OTHER LETTERS, that just popped out into the eye of the world, then retired hastily into their cell again, and are for ever invisible now. Their modest merit shrunk back from the light. They were not calculated to stand the broad eye of day. They retired with the spirits of darkness, before the beams of the sun. They took refuge in the shades, from which they had been painfully compelled. There they continued ever afterwards. And the only proof of their existence is, that they are recorded to have once appeared.

One of them is recorded by the commissioners at York. It is thus mentioned. "After the devise of the murder," they say, "was determined" upon the king, "as it seemed by the sequel; they," the rebels, "inferred upon A LETTER OF HER OWN HAND, that there was another meane of a more cleanly conveyance, devised to kill the King; for there was a quarrel made betwixt him and the Lord Robert of Holie-roode-house, by carrying of false tales betwixte thame, the Quene being the instrument, as they sayde, to bring it to pass; which purpose, if it had taken effect, as it was very
"likeli"

“likelie (for the one geving the lye to the other,
 “they were at daggers-drawinge), it had eased
 “them of the prosecution of the develish fact;
 “which, this taking none effect, was afterwards
 “most tirannously executed *.” This letter ne-
 ver made a distinct appearance again. Yet it was
 plainly considered as an important one by the
 rebels, by their dwelling so much upon it them-
 selves, and by their making the commissioners
 take so much notice of it. This also appears
 from that rebel journal, which I have mentioned
 formerly. There it is dwelt upon again. “Feb.
 “7,” it says under 1566-7, “she [Mary] ludged
 “and lay all nycht agane in the fore-said chal-
 “mer,” the chamber under the King’s; “and
 “from thence wrayt that same *nycht* THE LETTER,
 “concerning the purpose of the Abbot of Haly-
 “ruid-house. 8, She confronted the Kyng,
 “and my Lord of Halyruid-house, conform to
 “HIR LETTER wryttin the *nycht* befoir †.” This
 letter is also mentioned by Paris, in his second
 confession; when he says, that the Queen “*escri-*
 “*voit de lettres* a Mons. de Boduel, et les envoye
 “par le dict Paris au Sieur de Boduel, *environ*
 “*l’onze ou douze heures de nuit* ‡.” So important
 was the letter in the eyes of the rebels, as to be
 insisted upon very particularly. It has as much
 honour paid to it in the journal, as the letters
 from Stirling. It has more honour paid it by
 the commissioners, than they. And yet, after all,
 it has now disappeared for ever. This gives us

* Appendix, No. v. † Ibid. No. x. ‡ Goodall, ii. 80.

one instance more, and within a very short compass too, of a striking variation in the rebel evidence against Mary. But what was the reason of their conduct, in this instance? They found some absurdity in it, no doubt; of which it may be impossible for us to judge, as we have not a copy of the letter; and of which it might be equally impossible perhaps, if we had. Yet fortunately we can see the reason, though we have not the copy. That letter was fabricated upon the ORIGINAL PLAN of the letters. It was fabricated, when the MURDER OF THE KING was yet to be the object of them. This appears from the account given of it at York. “They inferred
 “upon a letter of her own hand, that there was
 “*another* meane devised to *kill the King*—, which
 “purpose, if it had taken effect,—had *eased* them
 “of” the murder by powder. And the journal concurs with this. “Feb. 5,” it says, “she,” Mary, “ludged all nyght under the King, in the
 “chalmer *qubairin the poulder was layd thair-*
 “*after*;—Feb. 9, She and Bothwell—past up—
 “to the King’s chalmer, and thair thay remaynit
 “cheriffing him, quhill Bothwell and his com-
 “plices hayd putt all thingis to ordour, and Pa-
 “ris, hir chalmer-child, *bayd reffavit in hir chal-*
 “*mer the poulder* *.” Both show the letter to have been framed, as one of a series, for fixing the murder of the King directly upon Mary. And it was therefore, what we may call ONE OF THE ORIGINAL LETTERS.

* Appendix, No. x.

That the rebels should have so far departed from their own grand variation, by which they changed the scope and design of the letters from murder to adultery, as to produce a letter concerning the murder; is very amazing. But it shows us the tremulous and desultory nature of guilt, very strongly. “*Animus impurus, Diis*
 “*hominibusque infestus, neque vigiliis neque*
 “*quietibus sedari poterat; ita conscientia men-*
 “*tem excitam vastabat; igitur—citus modo, modo*
 “*tardus incessus; prorsus in facie vultuque ve-*
 “*cordia inerat.*” Such is the general character of *conduct*, in the Catilines and the Murraies of all ages! We have seen the same sort of behaviour in them, before. We have particularly seen them, reverting to the point of murder in their charges, when they had previously gone off to adultery in their evidences. And we have additionally seen them, deliver in this journal with the letter; when the letters were now altered substantially, and when the journal was constructed for them as they stood before. “*Prorsus in facie vultuque*
 “*vecordia inerat.*”

But this is not the only letter, that, like a meteor, shoots suddenly across the eye, and then is lost for ever. We have others. Some, like the former, draw a train of light after them; by which they show themselves very distinctly, before they vanish away. Another just kindles, is seen, and dies. This is equally, though not in an equal degree, noticed with the former in the journal. Tracing the Queen’s motions from Edinburgh to Glasgow, and from Glasgow back to Edinbo-

rough again, with a view to the formation of the letters; the journal says thus: "Jan. 29, She remained all day in Linlythquow with the King, and WRAYTT FROM THENCE TO BOTHWELL *."

At this time and from this place, therefore, was one of the letters dated, which the rebels had previously designed to produce. It was, equally with the former, one in the series of *murderous* evidence. It was what we may call, ANOTHER OF THE ORIGINAL LETTERS.

When Lethington sat down to compose the letters for Mary, he naturally began to compose upon his previous ideas concerning them. He meant to prove the murder only. He therefore took his station, near to the time of the murder. He wrote a letter for her from Holyrood-house, three days only before the murder. He wrote another from Linlithgow, thirteen days before it. And so far he obviously pursued the line of his original plan. But he actually pursued it still farther. He wrote some letters for her, antecedent to both, from Glasgow. All these went on in a series of murderous evidence, from the 21st of January, when she set out to fetch the King from Glasgow, to the 10th of February, when the King was murdered. He thus formed an edition of the letters, which I have not noticed before; the first actual impression of them. And all were addressed, probably, to some confidante of her own sex. But, when he had thus drawn out his previous ideas upon paper, he saw the

* Appendix, No. x.

necessity for altering his plan. He must make the adultery, the harbinger to the murder. He must change the female confidante, into the adulterous Earl. He must have a new series of letters to him, for the seizure in April following. He instantly did all this. He added the new letters. He interpolated and reformed the old; to make them serve still. The time was pressing. And in his hurry he neglected to alter a circumstance, which I have noticed before in the first letter; and which shows to this day, that the letter was originally addressed, *not* to Bothwell, *but* to some other person; because it speaks of Bothwell, AS A THIRD PERSON. "Remember zow," it says with infinite absurdity to *Bothwell* at present, "of the purpois of the Lady Reres, of the "Inglismen, of his mother, of the Erle of Argyle, "OF THE ERLE OF BOTHWELL*." Bothwell is here spoken of, as equally a third person with "Argyle;" and as equally distinct from the person addressed, with "his mother," with "the "Inglismen," or with "Lady Reres." But no set of ideas, *at the time*, could have generated this gross absurdity. It could have arisen only from the collision of one set against another, a posterior coming over a prior, and the master of both not taking sufficient care, to reconcile them together. And thus we have a new series of letters, that interpose between the letters delineated on the mind, and realized by the pen, of Lethington at first, and the letters produced to the pub-

* See Vol. 2d, Lett. i, Sect. xxxvi.

lick afterwards ; an intermediate set, that partook of the ideas of both ; that insisted upon the adultery, and yet adhered to the murder.

But there are *several* of these meteorous letters, that appear, like the beams of the Aurora Borealis, all converging to a point, in the conference at Westminster. On the 8th of December, the day of the grand exhibition, the journal of the commissioners speaks thus. “ This daye,” it tells us, “ the Erle of Murray, according to the
 “ appoyntment yesterday, came to the Quene’s
 “ Majestie’s commissioners, saying : that, as they
 “ had *yesternight* produced and shewed SUNDRY
 “ WRYTINGS, tending to prove the hatred which
 “ the Quene of Scots bare towards her husband
 “ to the tyme of his murder ; wherin also they
 “ said might appear speciall arguments, of her in-
 “ ordinate love towards the Erle Bothwell : so,
 “ for the further satisfaction both of the Quene’s
 “ Majestie and theyr lordships, they were ready
 “ to produce and shew, a great number of *other*
 “ LETTERS *wrytten by the said Quene* ; wherin, as
 “ they said, might appear very evidently her in-
 “ ordinate love towards the said Erle Bothwell,
 “ with fundry other arguments of her guiltynes
 “ of the murder of her husband. And so ther-
 “ upon they produced seven several wrytings,
 “ wrytten in French IN THE LYKE Romain
 “ HAND ; as OTHERS her LETTERS, which were
 “ SHEWED YESTERNIGHT, and AVOWED BY
 “ THEM TO BE WRYTTEN BY THE SAID QUENE ;
 “ —the tenors of all which seven wrytings here-
 “ after

“after follow in order*.” In this curious and useful passage, we see a set of letters apparently different from the famous eight. *They* were produced on the 7th of December, but *these* on the 8th. *They* were equally with *these* avowed by their producers, to be Mary’s writing. *They* were equally in a hand like hers. *They* equally betrayed her violent regard for Bothwell. But *they* managed the regard in a different manner. In *these* the attachment to Bothwell is the primary object; while in *them* it was only a secondary. *These* were to show “her inordinate love towards “the—Erle Bothwell, *with* fundry other arguments of her guiltyness of the murder of her “husband;” and *they* “to prove the hatred “which the Quene of Scotts bare towards her “husband—, *wherin also* they said might appear “speciall arguments of her inordinate love.” In *these* that love is only made one “with fundry “*other arguments*,” of her concern in the murder. In *them* was shown “the hatred which the Quene “of Scotts bare towards her husband, TO THE “TYME OF HIS MURDER.” *They* therefore carried on the *murderous* part of the correspondence, to a later day than the eight do; even as late as the letters from Linlithgow and from Kirk-a-field, before. Yet *they* cannot be THE ORIGINAL LETTERS of Throgmorton. Throgmorton’s originals were merely ideal at first, and, when real, could have nothing of adulterous regard for Bothwell in them. But they are all that SECON-

* Appendix, No. viii.

DARY SET OF ORIGINALS, which I have just noticed to have been made, after Throgmorton's and before the present ; the intermediate work in the process of transmutation. They are not Throgmorton's. That is plain. They are not the present. That is still plainer. And yet they approach much nearer in nature and quality to them, than to his.

Here then is an amazing discovery from all. Here is a set of new jewels found in this casket of Mary's, nearly the same in number and in value, with all that we have seen before. So richly stored was it with diamonds of different waters ! Of the best were the famous eight. Of the next best were these new-discovered gems. And of the worst were the sonnets and contracts. But why were these letters, that are so much superiour to the contracts and sonnets, and so nearly alike to the famous eight, not brought forward with a confidence more suitable to their merit ? Why do they walk as pages, when they might rank as lords ? Why are they adduced to substantiate the handwriting of the eight, when they ought to have advanced with their own ? And why are they ordered to do that, when they could not substantiate *their* handwriting, any more than their own ? For this reason. In the gradations of refinement upon the original plan, these letters had superseded the letters of Throgmorton, and been superseded by the eight. Yet they were so similar to the eight, that they were preserved when they were superseded. They were kept for the purpose of co-operating with the eight, in pointing

pointing forcibly *their* charge of adultery and *their* surmise of murder against Mary, and in proving ostensibly *their* handwriting to be hers. They were produced as equal witnesses with the eight, to her inordinate love for Bothwell, and to her hatred of her husband. But then this was only an inferior view in them. The grand aim was, to support what so much wanted support, to ensure the credibility of the eight. In the collusive management of the principal actors among the commissioners, some form of collation was to be gone through, and some papers were to be furnished for the purpose. The papers, however, must necessarily be apochryphal. No other would do. The rebels were accordingly to furnish them. And they furnished these. Yet, since these had been superseded by the eight, they were not proper to be left with them, as standing witnesses against Mary. The whole weight of the evidences against her, must rest finally on the eight themselves. Of *these*, therefore, copies were left with the commissioners. Of *those*, not a copy, and not a scrip of a copy, remained behind, when the collation was over. They were not calculated for consideration, along with the others. They would have been found to clash with them. And they were therefore withdrawn wholly and for ever.

All this serves pointedly to show, with what an uncertain step, and with what an embarrassed countenance, the rebels advanced to produce their forged evidences. It serves peculiarly to point out to our observation, an EDITION of the letters,
of

of which we were totally ignorant before. We see that edition, and the present, very strikingly discriminated from each other, by being brought so closely together. And we see them additionally discriminated, by the very *number* of their letters. *This* has eight, and *that* had TEN. The number appears from Murray's and Morton's enumeration, of the contents of the capacious box; in their respective receipts concerning it. Murray owns to have received, with the box, "all
" missive letteris, contractis or obligatiounis for
" mariage, sonettis or luif-ballettis, and ALL
" UThERIS LETTERIS contenit theirin *." This is dated the 16th of September 1568, just before the conference at York. And from it there appears to have been in the box, even *then*, a series of writings "send and past betwix the Quene—
" and—Erll Bothvile;" *besides* the sonnets, the contracts, and the eight letters. This series is said by the commissioners at Westminster, to have consisted of "fundry writings," that were equally with the eight in form of "letters;" and that, like them, were calculated to prove Mary's hatred of her husband, and Mary's love for Bothwell. But they are noticed more minutely in Morton's receipt, the 22d of January 1571. Particularizing, as Murray's does, "the missive letteris, contractis or obligatiounis for marriage, sonettis
" or luif-ballettis;" it wraps up the general account in these words, "and," *not*, as Murray says, *all*, but, "UTHERIS LETTERIS THAIRIN

* Appendix, No. iv.

"CONTENIT,

“CONTENIT, TO THE NUMBER OF XXI*.” It thus gives us the exact detail of the “other letters.” And the well-known epistles being eight, the contracts two, and the sonnets one, the remaining TEN must be the amount of the others. Of these, as I have already observed, the letter from Kirk-a-field was one. This was produced at the conference in York. And, immediately before that conference, we see a number of letters in the box, very different from the eight, and yet as ready to be produced as they. The letter from Linlithgow was also another, as I have equally observed before. It carries an immediate relation to that from Kirk-a-field. It is the point in the scale of evidence, immediately antecedent to it, and connecting it and the Glasgow epistles together. And hence, as I have also observed, the letters produced at Westminster the night before the grand exhibition, are said “to prove the hatred which the Queen of Scots bare toward her husband, TO THE TIME OF THE MURDER;” one of them bringing it down within THIRTEEN days of the murder, and the other within THREE. The rest must have been from Glasgow and from Stirling; that series of letters, as the rebel journal witnesses, having some from both, like the eight. But then this shows us a great variation in the rebel conduct, with respect to the journal itself. Constructed originally for the prior series of letters, it was never altered afterwards for the posterious one.

* Appendix, No. iv.

And it now, very contradictorily, embraces both together.

But let me urge this point concerning the journal still further.—When the ten letters were framed at first, they were very similar to the eight, in *the circumstances related by them*. This may be shown satisfactorily, by a comparison between the journal and one of the eight, in a single point. In the former are these words: “ Jan. “ 27, the Quene (*conforme to hir commission*, AS SHE “ WRYTTIS) broucht the King from Glasgow to “ the KALENDAR towards Edynbrough; Jan. 28. “ the Quene broucht the King to LINLYTHQUOW “ —; 29, she remayned all day in LINLYTH- “ QUOW with the King, and *wraytt from thence to* “ *Bothwell*; 30, the Quene broucht the King to “ EDYNBROUGH, and patt him in HIS LUDGING “ QUHAIR HE ENDIT *.” But the passage referred to in the letters, is now found in the second of the eight, and runs thus: “ *According to my commis-* “ *soun*, I bring the man with me to CRAIGMILLAR “ on MONOUNDAY, *quhair* he WILL BE ALL WED- “ NISDAY; and I will gang to EDINBURGH, to “ draw blude of me †.” This is very plainly the passage alluded to by the journal. Yet there is a strange opposition between them. The journal carries the Queen on Monday, Jan. 27th, to Kalendar-House near Falkirk, a seat of Lord Livingston’s; on Tuesday, Jan. 28, conducts her to Linlithgow; and, on Thursday the 30th, brings her to Edinborough and Kirk-a-field. But the

* Appendix, No. x.

† L. ii. S. ii. in vol. 2d.

second of the eight, which has the connecting words in it at present, acts so differently from this; as to carry the Queen from Glasgow to the neighbourhood of Edinburgh on Monday, at once; to lodge her at Craigmillar, two miles from it, instead of Kirk-a-field at it; and to keep her there till Thursday; when it agrees with the journal to conduct her to Edinburgh, seemingly leaving the King at Craigmillar still, but really taking him with her, no doubt, agreeably to the journal. This, as to the main substance of it, is obviously in a direct and violent contradiction to the journal. Nor can the contradiction be palliated at all. The same words occur in the same letter, as described by the commissioners at York, from their own inspection of it. “In ane uther lettre sent
 “be Betoun,” they say, are these words: “Ac-
 “cording to my commission, I bring the man
 “with me to CRAIGMILLAR upon Munday,
 “quhair he will be all Wednisday, and I will
 “gang to Edinburt to draw bluid of me *.”

Indeed the contradiction in the letter to the journal, results from an essential difference between them, and a difference that is in the very plan and purpose of both. In the second letter, the Queen delineates her intended route for Craigmillar on the Monday following, intimates her intended stay at Craigmillar on Tuesday and Wednesday, and notes her intended departure from Craigmillar to Edinburgh on Thursday. And in the *very first* letter she is represented, as tel-

* Appendix, No. vii.

ling the king her design of carrying him to Craigmillar; and he is represented, as agreeing to it. "I answerit," she says, "that I wald tak him
 "with me to CRAIGMILLAR, quhair the medi-
 "ciner and I micht help him, and not be far
 "from my sone. He answerit, that he was reddy
 "when I pleisit." She also says in another part of the same letter, that the king "suld tak medicine and the bath at CRAIGMILLAR*." Here then is an amazing circumstance. Here are two sets of letters, relating the same design of the Queen's about leaving Glasgow, relating it precisely with the same reference to her commission, and yet giving it a direction totally different. The truth is, that the route and the time of the journal were calculated for the ten letters only. This is clear from the mention of one letter in the journal, that she sent to Bothwell on Wednesday from Linlithgow; when by the present letters she was actually at Craigmillar, and had been there ever since Monday night. The route and the time of the ten, were substantially altered from what they appear in the journal, to what they are in the eight; when the former were superseded by the latter. Yet, as we have equally seen in other points before, the journal was forgotten to be altered, though the letters were. And, what is still more, the two sets of letters, that were successively produced on the 7th and 8th days of December 1568, appear, in *some* of their letters, to have been *both* directed to Both-

* L. i. S. xii. and xxviii.

well AT THE SAME TIME and FROM THE SAME PLACE, and so to have clearly convicted each other of forgery; appear also to have related THE VERY SAME CIRCUMSTANCES IN THE VERY SAME WORDS, and so to have convicted each other of forgery again; appear also to have marked THE SAME TIME for the Queen's leaving Glasgow, but to have carried her from it BY A DIFFERENT WAY, to have brought her to A DIFFERENT PLACE, and to have kept her AT DIFFERENT PLACES ON THE VERY SAME DAYS, and so to have convicted each other of forgery a third time.

I dwell the more circumstantially upon these points, because a new variation arises at almost every advance, and each unites with each to form so many proofs of the general forgery. Wherever we turn our steps, we find ourselves disappointed in our expectations. The ground is nowhere solid. It sinks under us, and betrays us. The scene before us, also, is perpetually shifting as we approach, and mocking us. We are walking in fairy land. We are looking at fairy visions. And we are convinced on every trial, that all is magick and delusion around us. But I wish to contemplate one part of this magical exhibition, before it is entirely withdrawn from the eye with a little more particularity.

The eight letters were finally fixed, as the main supports of the accusation against Mary. But they were *five* only at York, and five only for a time at Westminster. And which of the eight were these? Let us examine. In the extracts made from them at York, the FIRST of the eight

is particularly insisted upon. It is made indeed by the commissioners, as it was by the rebels themselves, the central pillar of the whole building. Accordingly very large extracts are given us from it. This then is one of the five. But the commissioners immediately proceed to another. From this they give us a couple of extracts. And these show it to be the SECOND in the present publication. They then give us one extract from another. The passage extracted is found in the THIRD*. And all show the three first letters in the present eight, to have been those which were exhibited at York, three out of the four that were pretended to be written from Glasgow. But there was a couple of letters more, exhibited at the same place. "It appeared unto "us," say the commissioners, "by two letters "of her owne hand, that it was by hir own practice and consent, that Bothwell should take her "and carry her to Dunbar †." These therefore were two of the four from Stirling. There were only two from Stirling then. But which were they? Reason and the journal shall unite to tell us. In the delivered tale of the letters from Glasgow and Stirling respectively, the number was accommodated to the days, and one letter was assigned to one day at each place. Thus, as the Queen staid three days at Glasgow, the 24th, the 25th, and the 26th, of January; she had three letters attributed to her from it. And thus also, as she spent a small part of one day and the whole of another

* Appendix, No. vii.

† Ibid. No. v.

at Stirling, the evening of Monday, April the 21st, and all Tuesday, April the 22d; she was represented, as writing two letters from thence. This was a proper course of action for the forgers. This indeed was the natural course, which they should always have pursued in their forgeries. But they afterwards forgot this obvious principle of propriety. They annexed one more to the previous three from Glasgow. They subjoined two more to the original two from Stirling. They thereby involved themselves in the great absurdity, of making the Queen to write FOUR letters to the SAME person in THREE days; and in the still greater, of making her write AS MANY afterwards, in only ONE WHOLE DAY and ONE EVENING. And, as they had superadded the FOURTH to the first, second, and third; so we may be sure they annexed the SEVENTH and EIGHTH, to the fifth and sixth. This also the journal intimates to us. “April 21. viz. Mounday,” it says, “the Quene raid to Stirling, as it wes devyfit; and from thence wreyt THE LETTERIS concerning the purpose devyfit of hir ravishing; *qubair Huntly cam to hir, and began to repent him* *.” Accordingly we are informed in the fifth, that the brother-in-law of Bothwell (he having married Huntly’s sister) came to Mary; told her the enterprize she was upon, was a foolish one; asserted, she could never with honour marry Bothwell; declared his own followers would never suffer Bothwell, even seemingly, to seize

* Appendix, No. x:

her person ; and was totally against her present plan of action. And in the sixth we are equally informed that the brother of Bothwell still finds many difficulties in the business, that she thinks he advertises Bothwell of them, and that she apprehends he writes to Bothwell, for directions about them. The first, second, and third, the fifth, and the sixth, therefore, were the letters that were exhibited at York, at Westminster, and at Hampton Court.

The same disquieted spirit of villainy, which had planned and fabricated the first set of letters, only as a proof of murder ; which had new-fabricated the second, as evidences of murder and of adultery together ; which had written the letters from Glasgow, Linlithgow, Kirk-a-field, and Stirling ; yet had afterwards formed a third set, as merely arguments of the adultery and as merely hints of the murder, and had produced five of them, still dated from Glasgow and from Stirling : this perturbed spirit went to work, even now again, when all its operations seemed to be for ever precluded ; and when the number of these books of fate seemed to be fixed by the seal of destiny itself. We see this Dæmon, even so late as the 15th of October 1569, “ seeking rest, “ but finding none.” Even then, Murray appears adding to the evidences already put in, and sending up to Cecil the confessions of Paris ; whom however he had taken care to EXECUTE, as one of the murderers, BEFORE *.

* Goodall, ii. 88.

Was not that nobly done? ay, and wisely too;
 For 'twould have anger'd any heart alive,
 To hear the man deny it.

This man was living and in prison, the month of August before*. Yet it was prudent *not* to produce him in London, as Crawford and Nelson had been produced. He might have contradicted Murray's assertions, then. He could not contradict his depositions, now. And accordingly we find these depositions, which are two in number, lying one of them, the second and principal, in an attested copy among Cecil's papers, and ranging with them in the Cotton library, *Caligula*, C. i. fol. 318; while the original has migrated from his collection, and taken shelter in the Paper-office: and the other, the first, being equally in the Cotton library, but in the original itself, *Caligula*, B, ix. fol. 370 †. At another period, we know, he delivered in the rebel journal, of which I have made so much use against him. We have no note indeed of the delivery. But we find the journal, like the depositions, among Cecil's papers. It is equally lodged with them among the treasures of the Cotton library, *Caligula*, B. ix. fol. 247 ‡. And in the same un-noticed manner came the fourth, the seventh, and the eighth letters into Cecil's possession; and so were published, together with the rest, by him §.

But,

* Goodall, i. 137, and ii. 76.

† Anderson, ii. Contents, and Goodall, i. 145.

‡ Anderson, *ibid.* and Goodall, ii. 247.

§ For many years past, it has been urged as a popular ar-

But, in forming these additions to the delivered five, the forger was so much in haste, and so

gument in favour of Mary; that the rebels did not produce Paris at the conferences in England, though they had him then in their custody. The first hint of this was started by Keith, in p. 366. It was then enlarged upon very forcibly by Mr. Tytler, in p. 119—125. And it has been since repeated by Mr. Guthry, Scotch Hist. vii. 185, and by Dr. Stuart, i. 394—395. But the argument, as *thus* directed, must be given up. Truth requires me to say so. Nor would I wish, to conceal a single weakness in the defence of Mary's honour. Keith asserted in p. 366, that in August, 1569, "this man" "had been now *full two years and a half* kept in prison," as if he had been seized immediately on the murder of the King; which we know, from the very second of these confessions (Goodall, ii. 84), as well as from Keith's own history of the times, to be utterly false. Yet Mr. Tytler, from that inattention which will always mark some parts of every work, echoes Keith's account in this manner. "*In St. Andrew's*," he says, Paris "*lay for above two years*;" softening Keith's expressions a little, as if he half-suspected them; and adding, that he lay there, "during all the time, the conferences were" "carrying on at York and Westminster." And Dr. Stuart very naturally remarks, just as I was going to remark myself, upon the credit of both; "that, *at this very time*," the conferences in England, "there was actually in their custody, *in the prison of St. Andrew's*—Nicholas Hubert or French Paris" (i. 394. See also 447—448). But where is the proof for any part of this? *When* Paris was first seized by the rebels, does not appear. Mr. Tytler indeed, in his 3d. edition, p. 147, appeals to "Keith, p. 366," and "Throgmorton's letter, 18th July, 1567, paper office," for his vouchers. Yet the letter is as little a voucher, as Keith. It is the letter, which I have noticed so particularly before, and which was published entire by Dr. Robertson, ii. 374—378, and in the part alluded to by Goodall, i. pref. xvii. This shows not Paris to have been then seized. It shows only Powrie and Dalgleishe to have been. Where then shall we seek for the time of seizing Paris?

so little recollected in his dates, that he committed a gross anachronism in one of them; an
anachronism,

Paris? We cannot find it, in the seizure of so many others of the murderers at the Shetland isles, when "Grange took" a ship on the 1st day of September following (Keith, 459), in which were "the laird of Tallow [John Hay], John Hepburn of Bautoun,—and *divers others* of the Earl's servants" (Melvill, 85). Paris was no servant to Bothwell then. He was a servant to the Queen. Nor was he seized, even so late as the conference at Westminster; according to the rebel accounts. At this conference they presented to the commissioners, the examinations of Powrie, Dalgleishe, Hay, and Hepburn, as taken the 23d and 26th of June, the 3d of July, the 13th of September, and the 8th of December, 1567 (Goodall, ii. 236). "After this," say the commissioners, "they produced—a copie of *the proces, verdict, and judgment* against the foresaid John Hayeburn [Hepburn], John Haye, William Powray, and George Dalglech, as culpable of the murder" (ibid.). And "after this they produced—a wryting in a long paper, being, as they said, *the judgment and condemnation by parliament* of the Erle Bothwell, James Ormeston, Robert Ormeston, Patrick Wilson, and PARIS A FRENCHMAN, Sym. Armstrong, and William Murray, as guilty fundry wayes of treason for the murder" (ibid.). Paris was plainly not a prisoner yet. He was no more a prisoner than Bothwell. He was no more a prisoner than James Ormeston, who was not taken and executed till several years afterward (Crawford, 310). And Paris, like Ormeston, was seized, I doubt not, some months after the conferences in England, and some weeks only before he was executed. In saying this indeed, I may seem to the very zealous friends of Mary, to be more complaisant than I ought to be, to the testimonies of such convicted falsifiers. I would not willingly err in credulity, where I have such evidence of imposture. Nor would I err in incredulity. I may doubt their testimony. I always doubt it, where it is directly and pointedly in their favour. This common-sense requires, after such convictions. But then I cannot reject,

anachronism, which he could not have committed in a moment of leisure and reference; and which no forger of the letters, writing them in a regular consecution, could possibly make. The seventh letter opens with an address to Bothwell, concerning Huntly. "My Lord," it says, "sen
"my letter writtin, zour brother-in-law THAT
"was, come to me verray sad." This is a plain anticipation of the divorce, which was afterwards obtained reciprocally by Bothwell against his wife, and by the wife against Bothwell; she being Lady Jane Gordon, and sister to the Earl of Huntly. Huntly is therefore styled the "brother" of Bothwell, in the letter immediately preceding: and more fully his "brother-in-law," in the letter directly previous to that. These two letters calling Huntly "the brother" and "the brother-in-law" of Bothwell; the present could only have fallen into the absurdity, of calling him "the brother-in-law that was," from being written at a subsequent period. Both these letters also pretended equally with the present, to be written from Stirling, and equally to be written the 21st or 22d of April. Yet the divorce did not take place till SOME DAYS afterwards. And days in this case are equal to ages.

Tenth or ten-thousandth breaks the chain alike.

"April 26th," says the very journal of the

merely because I doubt. Because I suspect their accounts to be false, I cannot assume the contrary as true. And in the present case, where the point is indirectly and by accident only in their favour, I see no reason for even doubting or suspecting at all.

rebels,

rebels, “the *first* precept of partising of the Erle
 “Bothwell and his wyif,” at her suit against
 him, “was direct furth from the commissarys
 “of Edinbrough. 27. The *second* precept of par-
 “tising,” at his suit against her, “befoir Maif-
 “ter John Manderstoun, commissair to the
 “bishop of Sanctandrois, wes direct furth*.”
 In the latter point indeed, the journal is a little
 wrong. The second precept did not issue, even
 so early as April the 27th. We have a cotem-
 porary memoir, which shows the fact. It was
 the commission itself, which was dated that day.
 “The citation by precept” under it, did not
 issue till May the 3d afterwards†. Upon the
 29th of April and the 5th of May, was the *first*
bearing in each; as on May the 3d and the 7th,
 was *sentence* pronounced in each for the divorce‡.
 So clearly is the allusion in the letter, PRIOR to
 the fact alluded to! Just such an anachronism
 as this we have remarked before, in the terms of
 the rebel journal itself; a circumstance that im-
 plies it, like these additional letters, to have
 been finished in haste, and to have been never
 revised with attention afterwards. And this ana-
 chronism in the letter, resulted from the same
 principle of operation in the human mind, as
 that; the forger having forgotten the artificial
 combination of ideas for the forgery, therefore
 speaking unwarily from the natural and the
 present, and so making an anticipation, of which
 he was totally insensible at the time.

* Appendix, No. x.

† Robertson, ii. 449—451.

‡ Ibid. ibid.

Yet what was the reason, for breaking open the seal of destiny, as it were, and enlarging the number of the letters already exhibited? It must surely have been a very strong one. Nothing less than *necessity*, could have put Murray upon such a measure. And nothing less than *necessity*, can vindicate him in the eyes of policy for it. He and his compeers had already averred upon their honour, in writing to the commissioners of England, That all the papers, which they had produced, were found at one time and in one place. They “were interceptit,” they say, “and cum to our handis, clost within a silver box, in sic maner as is alredy manifestit and declarit *;” that is, no doubt, though this declaration and manifestation are since lost out of Cecil’s papers, they were taken with George Dalglish, servant to the Earl of Bothwell, upon the 20th of June 1567 †. They even produced the silver box itself, opened it in the presence of the commissioners, and exhibited the contents of it to them ‡. Yet, after all, they produced MORE letters

* Goodall, ii. 92.

† The friends of Mary think it a circumstance of a suspicious nature, that this declaration is not to be found among Cecil’s papers. I think it merely accidental. And, had it been found, it must have said just what Murray, Morton, and the journal say at present, in Goodall, ii. 90, 91, and 250.

‡ Goodall, ii. 379, where Cecil himself says, “that the very casket there,” in Buchanan’s Detection, “described, was here in England shewed, and the letters [and] other monuments opened and exhibited.” And Buchanan himself

letters of hers out of it. And they thus betrayed their forgery in the fullest manner, to the eyes of Cecil and Elizabeth. But both Elizabeth and Cecil fully knew it before. Murray, therefore, paid little attention to them. Human profligacy *sometimes* becomes so enormous, that men, like devils, have no scruple of exposing their villainies to those, whom they know to be equally villains with themselves. Yet this is *seldom* the case on *earth*. There is almost always some small remainder of virtue, some little sensibility of religion, and some faint solicitation of shame, in the most flagitious soul of man; that will not let him unnecessarily expose himself for a villain, even to a brother or a sister in villainy. He will conceal his flagitiousness, even from such a one. He will conceal it, even from himself. And he will show that involuntary respect to religion at times, as to fancy himself not so enormous a violator of its laws as others, and to take pride in his lesser remoteness from the influence of it. Murray, therefore, must have either reached to that diabolical extremity of wickedness, as not to have one particle of shame, in laying open his own profligacy to Elizabeth; or to have been stimulated by some strong necessity, that overpowered it. He certainly had no such necessity. The added letters prove nothing more than the others. They do not prove so much. They give not even a distant hint of the murder. And

self says in Hist. xix. 374, that “*arcula demum argentea in medium est allata,*” and “*in eâ inerant literæ,*” &c.

of the adultery they could tell us no more, than the others had told us before.

From the moment, that Murray resolved to make the adultery the principal object of the letters, and the murder to be as a distant point in the view, to which the adultery was gradually hastening; he seems to have thought of nothing, but to make the love on the side of Mary excessive and vehement. He has accordingly spread it out so thick and so broad, upon the face of the first five letters; that he has betrayed the gross hand of forgery, in the fabrication of them. Yet he still went on in the same strain, and betrayed himself again and again by it. He formed the contracts with this view. And he formed the sonnets with the same view. In the latter indeed, is such a disgusting appearance of affection, mean, fond, and sensitive; that an old maid of forty-five, who had never been courted before, would not have shown it to her man, even the evening before her marriage. Yet Murray stopped not here. He could not indeed go beyond this high point of fondness. He could not draw the melting maid in warmer colours. But he would be painting the same scene still. And he would be doing it, when every principle of propriety should have kept his hand from the pallet. He accordingly added one letter more, to the three from Glasgow. This was plainly composed, for the sake of making Mary express her *abjectness* of regard in these words. “Nouthar in that, nor in
“*ony uther thing,*” says this pretended Mary,
“*will I tak upon me to do ony thing without know-*
“*ledge*

“*ledge of zour will—.*” And, “my deir lufe,
 “*suffer* me to make zow sum prufe be my obe-
 “*dience*, my faithfulness, constancie, and volun-
 “*tarie subjeetioun*; quhilk *I tak for the plesandest*
 “*gude that I micht ressaif, gif ze will accept it.*”

The seventh was written with the peculiar purpose, of showing her earnestness from her regard, and her eagerness from her fondness, to have him seize her and carry her off. Nor was there ever a forward girl of eighteen, who was sickening for the paradise of matrimony, and wanted to be *banding* her beloved into a chaise for Scotland, more earnest and more eager in urging him to the expedition. “My lord,” she says, “sen
 “my letter writtin, zour brother-in-law that was,
 “come to me verray sad, and hes askit me my
 “counsel, quhat he suld do efter to morne; be-
 “caus thair be mony folkis heir,—quha wald
 “rather die,—than suffer me to be caryit away—;
 “he hes *abaschit me to se him sa unresolvit at the*
 “*neid*;—bot I have thocht gude to advertise
 “zow of the feir he hes,—that ze may have the
 “*mair power*; for we had zisterday mair then
 “iii. c. hors of his and of Levingstoun’s: “FOR
 “THE HONOUR OF GOD, BE ACCOMPANYIT
 “RATHER WITH MAIR THEN LES; for that is
 “THE PRINCIPAL OF MY CAIR. I—pray God
 “to send us ANE HAPPY ENTerview SCHORT-
 “LY.”

In both these letters, Murray makes this impudent ravisher, Bothwell, to be backward in his return to Mary’s advances, in order to show the forwardness of Mary the more strongly from it.

But

But the eighth letter goes beyond both. It surpasses the seventh in violence of regard. It exceeds the fourth in fervility of affection. It is indeed a masterpiece of meanness in love. I shall select only two passages. “To testifie unto
 “zow,” she is made to say, “*how lawly I sub-*
 “*mit me under zour commandementis*, I have send
 “zow, *in signe of homage*,—the ornament of the
 “heid.” “Without number,” she is made to
 add, “*ar the dreddouris to displeis zow*, the *teiris*
 “*of your absence*, the *disdane that I cannot be in*
 “*outwart effect youris*, as I am without fenzeitnes
 “of hart and spreit; and *of gude reffoun*, thocht
 “*[though] my merit is wer mickle greiter* than of
 “the maist profite that ever was, and *sic as I de-*
 “*syre to be*, and *fall tak pane in conditiounis to*
 “*imitate*, for to be *bestowit worthylie under your*
 “*regiment*.” So exceedingly surfeiting of fond-
 ness, are these additional letters made. And so
 exceedingly are they in the style of a green girl
 of fifteen, who is just beginning to feel the flutter
 of womanly sensations, is writing to her lover of
 forty with a pen as ready as her tongue, and yet
 looks up to him with a kind of filial awe. Yet,
 as all this had been said in the letters before, and
 said with as much pointedness of passion in them,
 and even said with more in the sonnets; nothing
 but the rash intemperance of guilt in Murray,
 that would be going on with its criminating for-
 geries, even when it had completed the full sum
 of them; and the prompt facility, with which he,
 and his “brothers of the deep,” were able to
 annex fresh articles at pleasure to their bill; could
 have

have seduced him and them, into the infinite folly of making these additions to it.

In the first form of the letters, the rebels had actually made “as apparent proof” against Mary “as might be,” concerning the murder. In the second, they had softened these apparent proofs of murder, into a “hatred towards her husband “to the time of his murder.” But then they had interwoven with it, “her inordinate love” for Bothwell. In the third, they took up this inferiour idea, and made it supreme; keeping the hatred, but placing it inferiour to the other. And this idea they prosecuted, with such an activity and perseverance of spirit, in the first five letters, in the contracts, in the sonnets, and in the last three, which are all the constituent parts of this third creation; that they repeated and redoubled those extravagancies concerning adultery, which they had previously fallen into concerning murder; that they twice as much overloaded the evidence now, for *unsealed* letters, and even for sealed, as ever they had done before; and they betrayed their own forgery to the notice of every eye, by the retrenchments which they made at one time, and by the additions which they made at another. So difficult is it to be a *guarded* villain; to do the deeds that a Murray did, with a foreseeing eye and an unshaking hand; and to be neither exposed by security, nor betrayed by cautiousness. Happy is it for the interests of man, during his short hour of residence upon earth, that this is the case. May the future Murraies of mankind, ever find it experimentally to be
be

be so ! And may those wretched traitours to the world, who with a masque upon their face, a dagger in one hand, and a poisoned bowl in the other, are perpetually destroying the peace of their brethren, for the sake of distinction among them ; learn to shrink back from the painful pre-eminence to which they are aspiring, and be glad to settle into good citizens, good men, and good christians *.

C H A P.

* Dr. Robertson, in his Dissertation concerning these letters, says thus, p. 36 : “ It is evident from a declaration or “ confession made by the Bishop of Ross, that *before* the conferences at York,—Mary had, by an artifice of Maitland’s, “ *got into her hands a copy of the letters—*. Brown’s Trial of “ the Duke of Norfolk, 31, 36.” This “ confession or declaration” is printed by Murdin, p. 62. In it the Bishop says thus : “ *Before* our passing to York, Robert Melvine com “ to Boltoun with letters, sent be Lidingtown from Falscastell “ to the Quene my mistrefs, to advertise her, that Therle of “ Murray was wholly bent to utter all that he could aganes “ the Quene, and to that effect had caried with hym all the “ lettres, which he had to produce aganes the Quene, for “ prove of the murther ; *wheroff* he had recovered the copie, “ and had caused his wyfe writ them, which he sent to the “ Quene.” This assertion of the Doctor’s, therefore, is seemingly grounded upon good authority. Yet I suspect that it is *not* true. That Maitland, or Lethington (as he is generally called), was a friend to Mary *at* the York conference, is plain from a variety of testimonies. Yet he sent her no copy of the letters, I apprehend.

Had he sent her one, it must certainly have been communicated to this very Bishop, who is here said to have known from Mary his conveyance of a copy to her, who was the great manager of all her concerns at York and at Westminster, and who stepped forward so boldly afterwards, to vindicate her character in print. But the Bishop appears decisively

CHAPTER VII.

§ I.

I HAVE now stated to my reader a multiplicity of variations, in the form and substance of the written testimony against Mary. Each

fively from his own memorial of December 17th, 1568, to have seen no copy *then*. He had gained, and from Lethington undoubtedly, some very particular intelligence concerning the letters. But he had no copy. Not afraid to use his intelligence, even in an address to Elizabeth; he tells her, as I have already shown, that the letters “contain na dait of “zeir, moneth, or day.” But, if he had seen a copy, he could not have said this. At York all the letters were dated. And the second was so at Westminster, and is so still. He says also, that “in the samin thair is na mentioun maid of “ony beirar” (Goodall, ii. 389). Yet the first and the last openly intimate *Paris* to be the bearer, and the second says expressly that *Beaton* was. And these persons are noticed accordingly by the commissioners at York, to be the mentioned bearers of the first and second (Appendix, No. vii). It is plain therefore, whether Mary had or had not a copy sent her *at* or *before* the York conference, that her very agent and confidante had certainly seen none at all, as late as the 17th of December, 1568.

But Dr. Robertson adds thus: “It is highly probable, “that the Bishop of Ross had seen the letters, before he “wrote the Defence of Queen Mary’s Honour in the year “1570.” This defence was *written* in the end of the year 1568, and the beginning of the year 1569; and was *published* by the *authour* in the spring of 1570 (Appendix, No. xii).

Each of these casts a very strong colouring of forgery over it. But the last particularly does so. Every one of the rest stands only as a single witness, against the authenticity of the papers. But

Yet it is very clear, and it is very remarkable, that the Bishop had not seen a copy, even so late as the *publication* of his Defence. This was also republished with alterations by the authour, in 1570-1; and our present copy is taken wholly from this second edition (Appendix, No. xii). Yet, so late even as 1570-1, he had not hitherto seen a copy. This appears from his repeating the same mistakes concerning the letters, in his Defence, and in the second edition of it too; which he had originally made in his memorial. He still asserts, that “there appeareth neither date, wherein they were dated, neither day nor moneth.” And, as he subjoins, “there is no mention made of the bearer, who is, as it may be supposed, for any name he beareth, the man in the moon” (Anderson, i. 18—19, Defence). So ignorant were Mary’s commissioners and advocates to the last, concerning the letters!

Nor, in all probability, was Mary herself more knowing. She revised this very Defence. She corrected it. She made notes, of some additions to be inserted in it (Appendix, No. xii). Yet she suffered these accounts of the letters, to remain uncorrected upon the face of the work. She could not have done this, had she known them to be false. She must have known them to be false, had she received a copy of the letters. In all probability, therefore, she had seen no copy at the time. And either the Bishop was deceived in his memory, which is not likely, as to Lethington’s sending her one; or else, which is very likely, this confession of his has been altered and interlined by that interpolating hand of forgery in Cecil, which has so frequently interlined and altered other papers concerning Mary (Goodall, ii. 199, 223, 235, 239, 247, and 254), and which was once concerned in a plot of actual forgery against her (Appendix, No. xiv). And the Bishop himself had certainly and undoubtedly seen no copy, as late as his first edition in 1569-70, or even as late as his second in 1570-1.

this

this infolds several within it. This has proved a kind of polypus upon trial. Merely one in appearance, it has shot out into many in fact. The parts of it, as they have been detached from one another, have each formed a separate whole. And the spuriouſness of the writings has appeared with evidence crowding upon evidence, from this and from all.

Yet there is still another variation behind. This is equally apparent upon the face of the history. It is not indeed *such a pregnant* variation, as the last. Yet it is a pregnant one. And it is much more important than any. I have therefore kept it to the last.

We have already seen the letters varying, in the very aim and object of them. We have also seen them varying, in the subscriptions. We have seen them varying too, in their directions, in their dates, and even in their number. But we shall now behold them varying, in the very LANGUAGE in which they were written. This must seem astonishing to my reader, at first. But it is undoubtedly true. And it is an incident very natural to knavery. The man that wants to exert his frauds of gambling upon the world, and therefore is constantly moving about from Bath to the Spa, from the Spa to Montpellier, and from Montpellier to Bareges; from the one to the other of those scenes of general assembly, where idleness is sure to generate play, and where the listlessness of ill health thinks itself compelled, to call in the gentle agitation of games of chance; such a man appears sometimes in this disguise of im-

position, and sometimes in that. A citizen of Europe at large, and speaking two or three of its principal dialects; he is successively a German Count, a French Marquis, or an English Lord. Just so, and with worse than the knavery of such a knight of industry as this, did the letters, which pretended to be written by Mary, appear at one time in the language of France, and at another in the dialect of Britain. They were Scotch, and they were French, just as suited the present purpose. Nor did this happen only, in the *assertions* of their holders. It was also true in *fact*. The letters underwent *a real* alteration in their language. And what had been purely Scotch for weeks and months together, turned out finally to be French.

But how is this surprising phænomenon to be accounted for? Shall we suppose, when Murray first discovered the letters in the silver coffer, that a pair of falsifying spectacles, through which he read them, threw a strange gloss over the lines, and made him mistake the French for Scotch; that he afterwards lent the same spectacles to his brother counsellors, and they were equally deceived by the same gloss; and that at last, by the accidental change of the spectacles, the imposition was detected, and the French appeared to every eye? Or, as this may seem too extravagant to be believed by any *but an enemy of Mary's*, shall we presume her to have known the modern secret, of writing *invisible* letters of intelligence; to have transferred this grand *arcanum*, from the business of spies to the commerce of love;

love; to have therefore written some apparent lines in Scotch, to have then inserted between them some imperceptible lines in French, and to have done both with their proper sorts of *sympathetick ink*? And shall we presume Murray, after he had long considered the Scotch as the whole of the letters, to have suspected the imposition; to have applied the proper *lixivium*; and to have seen his success, in the instant evanescence of the Scotch from the paper, and in the immediate emerfion of the French out of its invisibility? The fact certainly is, that the Scotch *did* disappear from under the eye, and that the French *was* found in its place.

Nor let it be suspected, that a circumstance of such a nature, and so completely unnoticed by other writers, cannot possibly be true in itself; or cannot possibly be proved to be so, with any degree of certainty. It is wholly unnoticed. Yet it is true. It may also be proved to be so, to a high, and even to a very high, degree of certainty. I pledge myself to prove it. I proceed to do so. For that purpose, I shall go back to the grand æra of the history preceding. I shall dwell particularly upon some points, that I have been obliged to mention before. I shall call others into light, that I have carefully kept under cover hitherto. And I shall thus conclude all the arguments, which I wanted to produce in vindication of Mary, within the compass of the present volume; referring a variety of others, with the letters and sonnets and contracts themselves, to the two next volumes.

§ II.

WHEN the letters were reported in their ideal form to Throgmorton, when they were actually presented to the council, and they were actually produced before the parliament; they were composed in the language of the island. They were Scotch letters, written by a Scotch Queen to a Scotch Earl. They were reported by a Scotch rebel, to an English embassadour in Scotland. And they were exhibited to a council and a parliament of Scotch.

Accordingly, when Throgmorton speaks of them, he gives us not the slightest intimation, that they were written in any language different from the language of the country. Had they been intended to be so, his informant must naturally have noticed the fact to him. This is strongly exemplified in Murray's own report concerning them, after they had put on their *French face*. "We producit," he says, "eight letteris "IN FRENCH, written by the Quenis awin hand*." He is *now* particular enough, we see, to mark the French language of them. He could not well be otherwise. And Lethington, who was the person undoubtedly that informed Throgmorton, must have been equally particular, if the letters had been equally in French. He had even more occasion to be so, than Murray. The latter was delivering instructions to a man, who had assisted him in all his operations at the conference, who

* Appendix, No. xi.

had united in presenting the letters to the commissioners, and therefore knew the language of them as well as himself*. But the former was speaking to a person, who knew nothing previously, and who could know nothing at the time, except from his own information. Yet he said not, though Murray does, that the letters were in French. Throgmorton's account of the information, runs merely these terms. "I do
 "perceive," he remarks, "if these men cannot
 "by fair means induce the Queen to their purpose, they mean to charge her with the murder of her husband, whereof (they say) they
 "have as apparent proof against her as may be,
 "—by the testimony of her own hand-writing,
 "which they have recovered." And every reader of this account must necessarily suppose, as Throgmorton must have equally supposed himself; that "the hand-writing, which they had recovered," was in the common language of the country.

But the real letters were afterwards laid, before the council and the parliament. They are accordingly noticed in the books of both. They are there noticed, just as we have seen them in Throgmorton's account before, without any specification of the language. They were, therefore, in the common language of the island still. The council describes them, as "divers hir previe
 "lettres writtin and subscrivit with hir awin
 "hand;" and the parliament characterizes them,

* Goddall, ii. 93, 109, 206, 207, and 84.

as “divers hir previe letteris writtin halelie with
“hir awin hand.”

In the council there were probably several, who understood not the French language. In the parliament there were certainly many. That all the counsellors of Scotland should be acquainted with French, is utterly incredible for any period, even of Mary's or her mother's government. We particularly know, that *some* of the rebel counsellors were not. We have already seen Mr. James Makgill, to be a man of considerable consequence among the rebels. He was even of so much, that he was sent on the 14th of August, 1567, together with the Earl of Morton, the Earl of Glencairn, and the justice-clerk; to wait upon Lynerol the French embassadour, and to return an answer to the message, which the latter had brought, concerning the imprisonment of Mary. Yet we have a plain proof, that even he was not acquainted with French. “Monf. “de Lynerol,” says Throgmorton,—“required, “—that he might have in writing what had been “said by the said Mr. James Macgill (who pronounced all the premises in *the Scottish tongue*); “which, upon the said de Lynerol's desire, was “*interpreted into French* by the justice-clerk*.” But a grand revolution had now taken place. In such a fermentation, we know, the *feces Romuli* of every community work up to the surface, Zeal and activity recommend to offices, in preference to rank and title. Some of the lower

* Keith, 444.

orders of life, therefore, are raised to the higher departments of the state. And, in this political kind of regeneration, some would naturally be made counsellors, who had never learned French. But in the parliament there must have been numbers. Some, perhaps many, of the lords; most, if not all, the knights; and all the burgessees to a man, I suppose; would range on the long list. We actually find one *baron* and many *gentlemen* at this period, who had not only *not* learned French, but could not even write their own names*. Yet to these members of the council and the parliament, as well as to others, were the letters produced. These were called upon equally with the others, to hear the letters; to consider them, as substantial evidences of murder against Mary; and to require the seals of some of the principal persons in each parliamentary estate, to be put to the law, that passed in consequence of them. It was resolved in the council, that “a
 “ parte of the three Estats,—Prellats, Bishoppes,
 “ Greit Barrons, and Burgessees, gif thair felis
 “ heirupon.” It was accordingly decreed in parliament, that “ane pairt of the three Estatis,
 “ —Prelatis, Bischopis, Greit Barronis, and Bur-
 “ gessis, gaif thair seillis thairupon †.” At this
 parliament,

* Anderson, ii. 233. “Michael Lord Carleyll, with my
 “ hand at the pen, Al. Hay, Notarius;” and others, 235,
 238, 239, and 240. And “most of these subscribers,” says
 Anderson in Gen. Preface, xxxvii. were parliamentary men.

† Goodall, ii. 65, 69, and 234. A few of each estate set
 to their private seals, in sign of the concurrence of the rest.
 “ Certain

parliament, say the rebels, was a greater assembly of members in all the three estates, than had been known for a hundred years before *. The ignorance of French, therefore, must have preponderated in an equal proportion. But there were certainly more provosts of petty boroughs in it; for then the representatives of boroughs were real burgessees, and the mayors of the burgessees; than had ever been known perhaps, in any parliament preceding †. The ignorance of French, therefore, must have preponderated very heavily in the scale. And, consequently, the letters presented to them could have been only Scotch.

They were in the same language, as Throgmorton's designed to be. Yet they were not the same letters as his. His were only to accuse Mary of the murder. They pretended not to reveal any adultery of hers, either with Bothwell or with others. But these were written directly to Bothwell. They were consequently big with adultery, and an adultery confined entirely to him. And, while Throgmorton's were "as apparent proof as might be" of the murder in themselves, these were obliged to be coupled with the subsequent marriage to Bothwell, to infer her privy to it. "Be divers hir previe letteris," says the act of parliament, "writtin

"Certain of the nobles," says Randolph to Cecil, Aug. 10, 1560, "subscribe unto them, and put to their seals." Robertson, ii. 321. And the number is "sex of the principales of every estate," in Keith, 76.

* Goodall, ii. 234, and Anderson, Gen. Pref. xxxvi.

† Goodall, i. 58, and Keith, 466.

"halelie

“ halelie with hir awin hand, and fend be hir to
 “ James sumtyme Erle of Bothwell, cheif execu-
 “ tour of the horribill murthour;—*and* be hir
 “ ungodlie and dishonourabill proceeding to ane
 “ pretendit mariage with him, suddandlie and
 “ unprovifitlie thairefter; it is maist certane, that
 “ fcho was previe,” &c *. So different were
 these from Throgmorton’s! They were evi-
 dently a new fet of letters, fabricated for the pre-
 sent purpose. Such was the origin of the SECOND
 series, the TEN that I have noted in the last
 chapter. These, as I have there shewn, were
 to Throgmorton’s and the eight the intermediate
 work, in the process of transmutation. The *se-*
cond series must necessarily be so, from its nu-
 merical relation to both. And, as the ten have
 already appeared to be the letters alluded to in the
 rebel journal, so were they demonstratively written
 in the Scottish language.

To prove this, I need only recite once more
 the account which the commissioners have given,
 of the exhibition of the eight and the ten together
 at Westminster. This “ daye,” they say, “ the
 “ Erle of Murray, according to the appoyntment
 “ yesterday, came to the Quene’s Majestie’s com-
 “ missioners, saying: that as they had yester-
 “ night produced and shewed fundry wrytings,
 “ tending to prove the hatred which the Quene
 “ of Scots bare towards her husband to the tyme
 “ of his murder; wherin also they said might ap-
 “ pear speciall arguments, of her inordinate love

* Goodall, ii. 64 and 67.

“ towards the Erle Bothwell; so, for the further
 “ satisfaction both of the Quene’s Majestie and
 “ theyr lordships, they were ready to produce
 “ and shew a great number of other letters, wryt-
 “ ten by the said Quene; wherin, as they said,
 “ might appear very evidently her inordinate
 “ love towards the said Erle Bothwell, with sun-
 “ dry other arguments of her guiltynes of the
 “ murder of her husband: And so therupon
 “ they produced seven several wrytings, wrytten
 “ in *French*, in the lyke Romain hand as others
 “ her letters, which were shewed yesternight, and
 “ avowed by them to be wrytten by the said
 “ Quene; which seven wrytings, being copied,
 “ were read in *French* *.” Here the opposition
 in the language is manifest, betwixt the letters
 of December the 8th, and the letters of Decem-
 ber the 7th. *Those* are particularly noted to have
 been *French*. *These* were therefore Scotch.

But we see it still more plainly, in the rebel
 journal. “ January 27,” it says, “ the Quene
 (CONFORME TO HIR COMMISION, AS SHE WRYT-
 TIS) “ brought the King from Glascow—to-
 “ wards Edynbrough.” That letter of the ten,
 which is here referred to, had evidently some
 words in it concerning “ hir commiffion.” They
 accordingly appear in one of the present letters,
 and run thus: “ According to my commiffioun,
 “ I bring the man with me,” &c †. And thus
 one of the ten was apparently composed, in the
 Scottish language.

* Appendix, No. viii.

† See Lett. ii. in vol. 2d.

There is also in the journal another intimation, which relates to another of these letters. “Jan. “24th,” the journal tells us, “the Quene re- “maynit at Glascow, lyck as she did the 25th and “the 26th, and hayd the conference with the King “whereof she wryttis; and in this tyme wrayt “hir BYLLE, and uther letteris, to Bothwell*.” The singular appellation of *bill* for one of Mary’s letters from Glasgow, given with so much ease, and given as a discriminating note of that letter from the rest; was plainly borrowed from the pretended Mary herself, who expressly calls her first letter a *bill*. Mr. Goodall, indeed, who was the first that observed this derivation of the name from the one to the other, has very justly remarked the word, by an accidental error of the press, to have been strangely altered into *bible*. “I am gangand,” says the Mary of the forgers, “to seik myne [repose] till the morne, quhen I “fall end my *bybill* †. If the first *l* in the word *bylle*, as Mr. Goodall very properly adds in order to account for this wild transformation, has the hair-stroke at the lower end turned up a little; or if a small spot of ink touches it; the word immediately lengthens into *byble* ‡. The vicious reading therefore is sufficient of itself, and with the aid of the journal is more than sufficient, to proclaim the genuine and original reading. All long writings, whether letters or not, were then denominated *bills*; as the short are denominated *bill-ets* to this day. Accordingly, the first letter is pecu-

* Appendix, No. x.

† L. i. S. xix. in vol. 2d.

‡ Goodall, i. 86 and 87.

liarly called by Mary her *bylle*, as it is a remarkably long one; and is actually asserted by the commissioners at York, to be “one horrible and *long* letter*.” And thus another of the ten is demonstrated, to have been written in the Scotch.

Those epistles then, which were dated immediately by the dates in the journal; which are referred to so specifically, in the terms of the journal, and were the second set of letters against Mary, the ten of Morton’s receipt, and the companions and mirrours to the eight at Westminster; were demonstrably written in Scotch. In Scotch they were, when they were presented to the council and parliament. In Scotch they also were, when the journal was completed. And in Scotch they continued to be when they appeared with the French eight at Westminster.

§ III.

THUS were the first and second set of letters against Mary, equally in the Scottish language! Thus did the pretended treasures of the gilt box, prove to be SCOTTISH letters, for SIX WHOLE MONTHS after the box, and its treasures, had been intercepted by the rebels! Nor would there ever have been any other letters, if Mary had not escaped from Lochlevin; if with a generous confidence, that never yet was the portion of flagitiousness, she had not thrown herself upon the compassion, the honour, and the friendship of Elizabeth; and if Elizabeth, with a baseness that

* Appendix, No. v.

is at once illustrated and aggravated by that generosity, had not founded upon it the infamous project, of loading Mary with a charge of murder, under pretence of adjusting her differences with her rebels. This project set all the wheels of Murray's machines to work. That fabrick of terrour, which had been erected before for the purpose of terrifying Mary by the parliament; and had been forced to be buttressed, even for its short hour of exhibition, by the provisional conspiracy against the life of Mary; would not bear to be transported into England, and shown to the commissioners there. A new one must be formed, that would stand of itself, and bear more inspection. A new set of letters was fabricated out of the old. The six also, which are the number that was probably exhibited to parliament, were now reduced to five, by the deduction of the Linlithgow letter from the whole. And, what was much more, the language of all was resolved to be changed. That such a violent alteration as this should be meditated, seems very extraordinary. But it was suggested by the everlasting anxiety of guilt. Knavery, ever watching the movements of its own shadow, suspicion, whispered in secret to its palpitating heart; that letters UNSEALED, and written in the common language of the country, might indeed by the impression of that strong conviction, which was employed to enforce them in Scotland, be admitted as evidences of adultery and murder there; but would be rejected as absolutely incredible in England, where such a conviction could not be employed,

ployed, and such an impression could not be made. In England, Murray could no longer command silence from fear, and generate credulity by enthusiasm. In the land of soberness and freedom, the mode of conveying the letters would be severely canvassed, and might perhaps lead to a detection at once. They were therefore to be re-formed. And they were to appear for the future, in FRENCH.

But the time was too pressing for their immediate departure, to allow a sufficient interval of preparation for their French appearance. Mary threw herself into the inhospitable arms of England, on the 16th of May, 1568. Murray instantly sent up proper instructions to his agent in London, Mr. John Wood; for intercepting all returns of kindness, from Elizabeth to her. He, therefore, offered to vindicate the whole of his proceedings against her. And he sent up the letters as his vindication. Elizabeth instantly, with all the promptness of a soul that had run a long career of policy and unfeelingness, closed with his offer. So early as the 8th of June she replied to it, and accepted it. “By your servant Mr. John Wood,” she says, “we have understood your offer, to “make declaration unto us of your whole do- “ings*.” Murray rejoined to this address, on the 22d of June following. “For our offer,” he says, “to mak her Majestie declaratioun of our “haill doingis, anent that quhair-with the Quene, “our souverane lordis mother, chargis us;—we

* Appendix, No. iii.

“ have ALREDDY sent unto our fervand Mr. Jhone
 “ Wode, that quhilk we traist fall sufficiently
 “ resolve hir Majestie, of ony thing scho standis
 “ doubtful unto.” This which he had already
 sent, he tells us afterwards, was “ sic LETTERIS
 “ as we haif of the Quene, our soverane lordis
 “ mother; that sufficientlie, in our opinioun,
 “ preivis hir consenting to the murthure of the
 “ king, hir lauchful husband *. So suddenly had
 Murray thought himself obliged, to dispatch the
 letters away for London ! He had no time, there-
 fore, for transmuting the Scotch of them into
 French. He had not even resolved upon the
 transmutation, *then*. He had actually sent them
 up in their native dress, without any intimation
 that it was a foreign one. They were yet in the
 Scotch language. “ Our fervand Mr. Jhone
 “ Wode,” as Murray adds, “ hes the copies of
 “ the famin letteris—IN OUR LANGUAGE †” And
 the letters continued to be SCOTCH, for MORE
 THAN A TWELVEMONTH POSTERIOUR TO THE
 DISCOVERY OF THEM. But a resolution being
 taken before the 22d of June, to put the letters
 into French; and these having been already sent
 up in Scotch; what was to be done, in order to
 pursue the resolution and to conceal the change?
 This was a pressing difficulty. How shall Mur-
 ray wind himself out of it? The letters are gone
 in Scotch. They cannot be recalled to be
 Frenchified. How then shall the new plan of
 operations be executed? It was executed thus.

* Appendix, No. iii.

† Ibid. *ibid*.

And this hero in artifice, only shines the more from his trials. He *enters* upon his measures immediately. He may afterwards *prosecute* them effectually. He speaks of the Scotch originals in London, as merely *a translation from another language*. “Our servand Mr. Jhone Wode,” he says in his verbal dispatch of the 22d of June, “hes the copies of the samin letteris TRANSLATIT “in our language.” This marks the commencement of the plan, for the French appearance of the letters. And it forms a very important epocha, in the annals of them.

But it was attended with a gross absurdity. If suspicion be the shadow of guilt, folly forms half of its substance. A sudden change from one mode of imposition to another, is sure to betray its knavery by its folly. And we have seen the observation repeatedly exemplified, in the variations of the letters before. The rebels are now to exemplify it once again. They send a *translation* of the letters, to prove a horrible imputation upon their Queen; when they profess to have the *originals*. They send letters to Elizabeth, that pretend to be the *handwriting* of Mary, and that, from her handwriting and her *words*, are to substantiate a charge of murder against her; and yet send them *without* any of her handwriting, and even *without* any of her words, in them. This is the very step and gait of villainy. It is all artificial and unnatural. Murray betrayed his villainy by it, to every eye except his own. The hunted ostrich thrusts his head into a bush for shelter, and never reflects on his exposed carcass

case behind. And men long practised in the habits of dissimulation, in constraining the honesty of nature within the trammels of knavery, and in torturing man into a fraudulent over-reacher of his brethren; seem at length to lose their discernment by the very exercise of it, to forget what is natural amidst their attention to artificial operations, and to confound their understandings in the tangles and mazes of their cunning.

§ IV.

THUS had Murray determined to appear against Mary, in the presence of Elizabeth's commissioners, with a set of French letters. Thus had he even announced his intentions, in a formal manner to Elizabeth herself. Yet, after all, he remained dubious about it. Appear against her he must. But whether he shall appear with French or with Scotch letters, he cannot decide at present. We therefore see him at this period ridiculously suspended in his conduct; betwixt his reasons and his annunciation upon one side, and some counter-reasons, that now presented themselves to his imagination, on the other. The wavering balance continued to incline successively, both ways. And at last it settled into its primary inclination, in favour of Scotland.

When Murray resolved upon French letters, he did it in one of those sudden impulses of conviction, that frequently rush in at once upon the thinking mind, and seem to be the momentary irradiations of some opening sun within it. The absurdity of sending such letters unsealed, and in

the ordinary language of the country, flashed all at once upon his understanding. He must still send them unsealed. He could not supply the defect of Mary's signet. But he could alter the letters accordingly. He had already done so in the dates, the subscriptions, and the directions. And, the moment this new conviction darted in upon him, he resolved to make another and a grander alteration, by changing the language. As the same principle had already put him upon other reformatations of the letters, it was sure to operate *first* upon his spirit at present, and to put him upon this the greatest of all. A Frenchman, indeed, appeared to be the bearer of two of the letters *. But a Scotchman appeared to be the carrier of another †. And Scotchmen must be presumed to be the conveyers of all the rest. With this conviction acting forcibly on his mind, he had said what he *had* said, to Elizabeth's agent on the 22d of June. Yet when the agent was gone back to London, and Murray had leisure to think over the whole matter comprehensively; he began to hesitate betwixt contrary convictions. He beholds absurdity encountering absurdity. And how shall he win his way through them unhurt? That the letters were in Scotch, at the time of their appearance before the parliament; must have been known to all who saw or who heard them there, and through them to the whole nation. If the letters should now make their appearance in French; the commissioners of Mary

* Paris of the 1st and 8th.

† Beaton of the 2d.

would certainly, with every seal of secrecy that could be stamped upon the proceeding, come to the knowledge of it. And they would be happy to catch at such a damning proof of forgery as this, and to trumpet it round the island. This was a very powerful principle of attraction, towards the old system of Scotch letters. But then there was an equally powerful one, in favour of the new system of French. He had increased the influence of the latter too, by the message which he had sent to Elizabeth. And from the mutual counteraction of both, a third principle was generated, which kept him from following either, and made him move *in circulo* a while.

The same apprehensiveness, which put him upon thinking to make his letters French, put him equally upon adding other writings to them. *Those* were to be new dressed for the new exhibition, which they were to make upon the theatre of England. *These* were to enlarge the number of the *Dramatis Personæ* there. He therefore formed a couple of marriage-contracts for Mary. He also formed one long sonnet for her. And he subjoined a new set of letters to both. But *how* did he execute his purpose? With a fair equipoise of affection for Scotland and for France. One of the contracts was drawn up in Scotch, and the other in French. In French was the sonnet composed. But in Scotch were the letters written. So apparently was the mind of Murray, at this period, hanging *in medio* betwixt Scotland and France;

Like Mahomet's tomb, 'twixt earth and heaven!

That the sonnets were written originally in

French, was formerly denied with strenuousness by the partisans of Mary. It is now admitted with faintness only. But it is exceedingly clear in itself. They are attended indeed, like the letters, by a Scotch copy. But the copy is demonstrably a translation. This the whole air and complexion of the language shows. This the rythmical nature of the *stanzas* in the one, and the un-rythmical course of the *lines* in the other, decisively proves. And I need only refer my reader to the *first* strophe of both in the third volume, in order to convince him at a glance; that the French is the original, that the Scotch is a translation. and is a flat, a verbal, and a vicious one*.

But the five letters, which were now to be presented together with the sonnets in England, were not, like them, in French. They should have been, in conformity to the plan of June the 22d above. They should have been, in correspondence to that partial execution of it in the sonnets. Yet they were not. The principle, which had produced the sonnets, was deserted in the letters. And Murray settled again upon his original ground, in a set of Scotch letters,

§ V.

THE exhibition of the writings against Mary, was determined by Elizabeth to be made at York. Formal preparations were accordingly made for

* It is but justice to Dr. Robertson to observe, that he was the first, who argued the sonnets to have been originally French, and who used this kind of argument to prove them so. See his Dissertation, 33—34.

the purpose. The theatre was opened. The actors were ready. And the curtain was just beginning to rise; to display the casket of Mary, like Portia's in the play; and to invite the commissioners solemnly to the fight. But lo! just at the critical moment, Murray steps out upon the stage, like an old prologue, and shows all the substance of the play before-hand. On the 10th of October he delivered the letters, sonnets, and contracts, privately to the commissioners. They noticed them however, even in this clandestine production of them, with an attention; which was very proper in itself, and is peculiarly useful to us. They first gave a general account of each of them, in a dispatch to Elizabeth. They then added an analysis of the three principal of them. To both, they subjoined a long series of extracts from the three. These extracts are peculiarly important to our present purpose. They indicate the language of all at this period, beyond a possibility of doubt. And I shall lay this very decisive, though thitherto unobserved, testimony concerning it; in its full force before my readers.

The commissioners form what they call, "notes
 "drawin furth of the Quenis lettres sent to the
 "Erle Bothwell." In these they give us extracts, out of each of the three first letters in the present publication. They particularly dwell upon the first. Its contents and its length demanded this attention, at their hands. And I shall therefore dwell upon it too.

"Imprimis," they say of the first, "after lang
 "discourse of hir," Mary's, "conference with

“ the king hir husband in Glasgow ; sche wraitis to
“ the said Erle IN THIR [these] TERMES.” They
then begin their extracts. The first runs thus :
““ This is my first jurnay, I fall end the same the
““ morne ; I wreite in all thingis, howbeit they be
““ of littill weycht, to the end that ye may tak
““ the best of all to judge upoun ; I am in doing
““ ane wark heir, that I haitte gretlie : Haif ye
““ not desyre to lauche, to sie me lie sa weill, at
““ the leist to dissemble so weill, and to tell him
““ the treuth betwix handis.” They immedi-
ately add this remark and this extract. “ Item,”
they say, “ shortly after : ““ We are coupled with
““ twae fals racis ; the devill fyndere us, and God
““ mot knit us togidder for ever, for the maist
““ faithful cupple that ever he unitit ; this is my
““ faith, I will die in it.” They directly pro-
ceed to this passage, and preface it in this man-
ner : “ Item, thairefter, ““ I am not weill at ease,
““ and zeit verray glaid to wreit unto you quhen
““ the rest are slepand, sen that I cannot sleip as
““ they do, and as I wald desyir, that is in your
““ armis, my deir luife.” These, I suppose, are
sufficient to prove my point concerning the first
letter. But, that I may not leave one single
shade of doubt upon the mind of my reader, I
shall lay a couple of extracts more before him.
The weight of the argument will not be really in-
creased by them. One passage from one letter
would suffice for that. But the impressiion upon
the mind will be the greater. And this should
be considered by an authour, as well as the other.
“ Item,” the commissioners proceed, “ thus sche
““ concludis

“concludis the lettre: “Wareit mocht this
 “pokishe man be, that causes me haif sa meikill
 “pane, for without hym I wald haif ane far
 “mair plesant subject to discourfe upoun: He
 “is not oer meikle spilt, but he has gottin verray
 “mekill; he has almaiſt flane me with his braith;
 “it is war nor your unclis, and zeit I cum na
 “neirar, bot fat in ane cheir at the bed-fute,
 “and he beand at the uther end thairof.” And,
 as they go on, “Item, Thairefter, “ye gar me
 “diſſemble ſa far, that I haif horring thairat,
 “and ze caus me almaiſt do the office of an
 “trahatores: Remember yow, yf it wer not to
 “obey yow, I had raither be deid, or I did it; my
 “heart blidis at it: Summa, he will nat cum
 “with me, except upon condition that I ſall
 “be at bed and bourd with hym as of befoir,
 “and that I ſall leiſe hym na efter.”

But I have tired myſelf, and, I ſuppoſe, my
 reader, by giving theſe extracts. Yet there are
 no leſs than fix more, behind. Thoſe will ſhow
 however, in the moſt demonſtrative manner, that
 the FIRST letter continued to be Scotch, as late as
 the conference at York. And, if the firſt was,
 we may be ſure the reſt were too. But let us not
 leave the point upon inferences, when we can fix
 it upon poſitive proofs. The ſame chain of evi-
 dence extends ſtill farther. And it carries the
 ſame electrical ſtroke of conviction, from the ſe-
 cond and the third letters, as well as the firſt.

The commiſſioners enter upon the ſecond letter
 thus: “Item, in ane uther letter ſent be Betoun:
 “As to me, howbeit I heir noe farther newes
 “from

““ from yow, according to my commiffion, I
 ““ bring the man with me to Craigmillar upon
 ““ Munday, quhair he will be all Wednifday;
 ““ and I will gang to Edinburt to draw bluid of
 ““ me, gif in the mene tyme I get no newes in the
 ““ contrair from yow.”” They go through with
 it thus: “Item, Verray fchortlie after: “Sum-
 “ma, ye will fay he makis the court to me, of the
 “quhilk I tak fo gret plefeur, that I enter never
 “quhair he is, bot incontinent I tak the feiknes
 “of my fyde, I ame foe fafchit with it; yf Pa-
 “reis bring me that quhilk I fend hym for, I
 “treast it fall amend me: I pray yow adverteis
 “me of your newes at length, and quhat I fall
 “do in caice ye be not returnit quhen I cum
 “thair; for, in cais ye work not wyfelie, I fie
 “that the haill burthin of this will fall upon my
 “fchulderis; provyde for all thingis, and dif-
 “courfe upon it firft yourfelf.””

Thefe passages fhew the fecond letter to have
 been, equally with the firft, continued in the
 Scotch language, even down to the exhibition of
 both at York. But let us now apply the *conductor*
 to the THIRD letter. And we fhall fee the fame
 fparks of light, iffuing with the fame ftrength and
 loudnefs from it.

The commiffioners advance up to it, in this
 manner. “Item,” they fay, “in ane uther let-
 “tre: “I pray yow, according to your promeis,
 ““ to difcharge your hart to me; utherwayis I will
 ““ think that my malheure, and the guide com-
 ““ pofing of thame, that hes not the third part of
 ““ the faythfull and willing obedience unto yow
 ““ that

““ that I beyre, has wyne, againis my will, that
 ““ advantage over me quhilk the fecund luif of
 ““ Jafon wan; not that I wolde compair yow to
 ““ ane fa unhappie as he was, nor yit myself to
 ““ ane foe unpertifull a woman as fche; howbeit
 ““ ye cause ma be fumquhat lyck unto hir in ony
 ““ thing that twichis yow, or that may preserve
 ““ and keip yow to hir, to quhome ye onlie ap-
 ““ pertein; yf it may be fuer that I may appro-
 ““ priat that, quhilk is wonne throuche faythfull,
 ““ yea only luifing yow; quhilk I do and fall do
 ““ all the dayis of my lyif, for pane and evil
 ““ that can cum thereof: In recompense of the
 ““ quhilk, and of all the evil quhilks ye haif bein
 ““ cause of to me, remember yow upon the place
 ““ heir befyd, &c *.”

The three first letters, then, were demonftrably
 written in the Scotch language. They are evi-
 denced to have been fo, by the luftre of their
 own light. Nor let any attempts be made to
 fhroud this fun, which fhines fo brightly; by fan-
 taftical allegations of Murray's prefenting a
 Scotch tranflation at York, as he pretended be-
 fore to have fent a Scotch tranflation to London.
 Murray himfelf forbids the attempt, and denies
 the allegation. “ The faid erle,” as the commif-
 fioners themfelves inform us, “ hath been con-
 “ tent privatlie to SHEW US SUCH MATTEIR,
 “ AS THEY HAVE to condempne the Quene of
 “ Scottes, of the murder of her husband.” His
 affiftants accordingly “ fhewed unto us,” as they

* Appendix, No. vii.

add, “a *copie* of a bond bearing date,” &c.
“There was also a contract shewed unto us,” as
they further add, “*signed with the Quene’s hand,*
“and also with Bothwell’s, bearing date,” &c.;
“and there was also a contract shewed unto us,
“*of the Quene’s own hand,*—bearing no date.”
But as they subjoin concerning some of the letters,
“it appeared also unto us by two letters OF HER
“OWNE HAND, that it was by hir own practice
“and consent, that Bothwell should take her and
“carry her to Dunbar.” These were evidently
two of the letters from Stirling. From neither
of these have we had any extracts before. Yet
these were equally produced, we see, with the
other. And they must therefore have been
equally Scotch, with them. But let us hear the
commissioners again. “After the devise of the
“murder was determined, as it seemed by the
“sequel; they inferred upon a letter OF HER OWN
“HAND, that there was another mean, of a more
“cleanly conveyance, devised to kill the King;
“for there was,” &c. These were all very evi-
dently, not copies, not translations, but originals,
letters (as was pretended) in the very handwrit-
ing of Mary. But let us now come to those let-
ters themselves, from which the extracts were
made. The commissioners thus speak of the first
and principal of them: “Afterwards they shewed
“unto us one horrible and long letter OF HER
“OWN HAND, as they saye, conteyning,” &c.
This was very evidently not a translation, and
not even a copy, but the original itself, the very
letter which they pretended Mary to have writ-
ten

ten to Bothwell. And the commissioners finally close their whole account in such a manner, as proves this, as proves the two others, and as proves all that were produced, to have been the very originals themselves. “These men heare,” they say, “do constantlie affirme the said letters, “and other writings, which they produce on “HER OWN HAND to be HER OWN HAND in- “dede; and do offer to swear and take their “oaths, thereupon*.” Thus is Murray expressly affirmed to have asserted, and to have even offered to swear, that the letters particularly, which he showed to the commissioners, were the very letters which Mary had sent; were in the very writing, in which Mary had penned them; and were in the very language and terms, in which Mary had composed them.

The letters then were Scotch, at their appearance in York. They were Scotch, in the parliament before. They were Scotch, in the council preceding. And they had now remained Scotch, from their first creation in the end of November 1567, to the middle of October 1568; through the long period of ten or eleven months. In this compass of time they had undergone many alterations, some formal, and several substantial. But they had admitted no alteration in this respect. Their primary dialect still remained upon them, under every change. It seems to have been the original *stamen* of their constitution! It seems to be in the letters, what the bone LUTZ of

* Appendix, No. v.

the Hebrews is said to be in the body, what no accident impairs, what no destruction annihilates, and what triumphs equally over the casualties of the world, and the desolations of the grave.

§ VI.

SUCH did the language of the letters remain, to the present moments of their history. But such it does not long remain afterwards. The hour of alteration, indeed, is already come. And this original *stamen* of their constitution, is now to be broke; this sacred bone in their body, is now to become a prey to dissolution; and the changes undergone by them before, shall be consummated in its fall.

When Murray exhibited his letters in parliament, he exhibited them in the native language of the country. This was therefore a fact, if ever any was, of such a quality and nature; as was too publick not to be known, and too notorious not to be owned. Yet, in spite of its publickness and notoriety, Murray afterwards pretended to Elizabeth; that the letters were in FRENCH. So coolly confident could he be at times, in his own powers of assertion! But, *within only four months afterward*, he actually produced them to her commissioners in SCOTCH. And this slight union of facts shows us strikingly, the lively immodesty, and the prompt versatility, of guilt in him. We have even a stronger evidence of both, yet behind. In *eight or nine weeks only*, after he had presented his letters in SCOTCH; he again presented them in FRENCH. This shows us still
more

more strikingly, the bold and hardened forehead of falsehood, which his habitual hypocrisy had given him. On the 8th of December he appeared before those very commissioners, who had been shown the letters in SCOTCH on the 10th of October before, who had drawn up an account of all of them, who had formed an abstract of three of them, and had made considerable extracts from the three; and to them he exhibited the letters again, in FRENCH. This even exceeds all that amazing “power of face,” which we have seen exercised by Murray before. Perhaps the world never saw a more astonishing spectacle of profligate assurance, than this. And audacious vice had certainly rubbed his brow, with her hardest pumice :

Perfricuit frontem, posuitque pudorem.

But let not Murray bear all the blame. The commissioners of Elizabeth, and Elizabeth herself, must come in for a large share of it. The former had seen, perused, and studied the letters. One of them, probably, had drawn up the general account of each of the five produced. Another had formed the analysis of the principal three. And the third had made the large and numerous extracts from them. That they were in SCOTCH therefore, that in SCOTCH they pretended to be of Mary's handwriting, and that in SCOTCH Murray and his allies offered to swear, and solemnly asserted, them to be of her handwriting; must have been indelibly impressed, upon the minds

and

and memories of a ll. Yet only a *few*, a *very few weeks* afterwards, they saw the same letters in the same handwriting, presuming to mock at their minds, and to insult over their memories; by presenting themselves now in FRENCH, and still pretending to be Mary's and the same. And, what seems amazing; to an honest spirit, they beheld the bold deception, and received the daring imposture, without reprehension and without remark.

But it was all chargeable to Elizabeth. She was the sun of the whole system. They were merely her planets, actuated by her influence, attracted towards her center, and moving in dutiful attendance about her orb. She had received their dispatches concerning the letters, from York. She had read their general account of them, their analysis, and their extracts. She had laid them all before her privy council. And she had written a reply to all. That the letters of Mary were *then* in SCOTCH, must have been engraven in characters of brass upon her memory, for half a century of years. Yet she, even she, in *fifty-nine days only*, suffered the letters to be reproduced in FRENCH; suffered them still to maintain their claim to the hand of Mary; and even solemnly ratified their claim on collation, before the same counsellors and the same commissioners.

She was the secret cause of all. Her privy counsellors presumed not to see but with her eyes, and her commissioners pretended not to hear but with her ears. They thought only as she suggested.

gested. They saw her intimate her decree, that Mary had written the letters originally in SCOTCH, that Mary had also written them originally in FRENCH, and that EITHER, or that BOTH, should be admitted as her handwriting. They instantly carried it into execution. The FRENCH became SCOTCH, and the SCOTCH became FRENCH, at her bidding. The *transubstantiation* took place, as the papal mandate ordered. And it forms a wonderful addition to all that we have delineated before, of this *Pope Joan*, her counsellors, and her commissioners; and gives us the fullest and the completest picture, that it is possible for the human pencil to draw, of the baseness of servility in them, and of the daringness of effrontery in her.

So far I have trusted to the memory of my reader, for the proofs of this amazing fact, the appearance of the letters in FRENCH at Westminster. The passages that prove it, have been too often on the stage to be readily forgotten. But let them be brought upon the boards again. The fact is of such an astonishing nature, such a monster in its form and substance; that the mind shrinks back from it with horror, and recoils forcibly upon itself with the shock of incredulity. Yet, however monstrous, it is true. The journal of Elizabeth's commissioners, the books of Elizabeth's privy counsellors, and a letter of Murray's own, all unite to prove it. "This day," says the first on December the 8th, "the Erle of Murray, according to the appointment yesterday, came to the Quene's Majestie's commissioners, saying, that as they had," &c. "so
VOL. I. L 1 "therupon

“therupon they produced seven several wrytings
 “wrytten in FRENCH—; which seven wrytings,
 “being copied, were read in FRENCH, and a due
 “collation made therof,” &c *. A few days
 afterward, Elizabeth called her council together,
 and added six of the nobles, all earls, extraordi-
 narily to it; under pretence of collating that
 handwriting in FRENCH, which, from its being
 FRENCH, she knew decisively to be a forgery,
 with some letters of Mary’s own to her. “There
 “were produced,” says the council-book, “fun-
 “dry lettres written in FRENCH, supposed to be
 “written by the Quene of Scotts own hand, to
 “the Erle Bothwell †.” And “we,” says Mur-
 ray in his short history of his own transactions,
 “producit eight letteris in FRENCH, written be
 “the Quenis awin hand, and sent to—James—
 “Erle of Bothville ‡.” So evident is the fact,
 upon the papers of these, the passive or the active
 confederates, in the boldest audacity of flagitiouf-
 ness! And so strongly does it throw a light back,
 upon all their proceedings before; vindicating
 the strongest censures of their enormity, there;
 showing that enormity, in a still stronger point of
 view; and even carrying it to the highest eleva-
 tion possible, of human imposture, and of human
 impudence.

These pretended letters of Mary’s, were origi-
 nally SCOTCH. They then were FRENCH. They
 yet became SCOTCH again. And they became

* Appendix, No. viii.

† Ibid, No. ix.

‡ Ibid. No. xi.

FRENCH finally. Nor would Elizabeth have blushed, nor would her managers have hesitated, one may safely pronounce at the close; to admit them as Mary's, and to found a charge of murder upon them, in ANY or in EVERY language under the moon *.

§ VII.

THE French letters, then, were only a translation from the Scotch. This had been much disputed formerly. Mr. Goodall was the first who suspected it. And the suspicion appears at present, to have done high honour to his sagacity. It is now carried into certainty. It is now founded upon the basis of FACTS. But he saw it only from a view of the letters themselves, by the light which they bore in their own bosom. Yet this is managed so well, that he illustrated his position very strongly by it. He gave indeed such convincing proofs of the point, that no man of candour in the business of thinking, no man of honour in the intellectual commerce of life, could possibly deny the force of them †. Yet Mr. Hume and Dr. Robertson did. For the dignity

* Yet in Goodall, ii. 379, Cecil has the boldness to assert, that the letters, &c. were “by testimonies and othes of men
“of honor and credit of that contrey,” Scotland, “testi-
“fied and avowed—to have been written and subscribed as is
“there,” in the Detection, “alledged, and so delivered
“without *rasure, diminution, addition, falsifieng, or alteration*
“in any point.” This is surely in the highest tone of Elizabethan effrontery.

† Goodall, i. 81—98.

of literature, and, what is infinitely more in value, for the majesty of virtue itself, I am sorry I am compelled to say it. They denied it in reality, when they were obliged to acknowledge it in appearance. They owned the French copy which we have at present, to be undoubtedly a translation from the Scotch. But then they begged leave to suppose, and even presumed to maintain; that *the present copy was not the same, as was exhibited at Westminster*. “We have not,” says Mr. Hume, “the originals of the letters, “which were in French; we have only a Scots “and Latin translation from the original, and “a French translation professedly done from the “Latin *.” “We may observe,” says Dr. Robertson, “that all this authour’s,” Mr. Goodall’s, “premises may be granted, and yet his conclusion will not follow; *unless* he likewise “prove that the French letters, as we now “have them, are a true copy of those, which “were produced by Murray and his party, in the “Scottish parliament, and at York and Westminster—. Our authour might have saved himself the labour of so many criticisms, to prove “that the present French copy of the letters is a “translation from the Latin. The French editor “himself acknowledges it, and, so far as I know, “no person ever denied it †.” This is surely the last and desperate effort of baffled credulity. Having no longer any footing upon earth, they endeavour to fix themselves in the clouds. And

* Hist. v. 147.

† Diss. 30—31.

they are ready to raise supposition upon supposition, and to pile assertion upon the head of assertion, “*imponere Pelio Oſſam* ;” in order to ascend thither. But let us pursue them into this, their last, retreat. And we shall soon bring them back to earth again *.

It is very observable, that Dr. Robertson does not positively assert the existence, of such an imaginary original. He only *insinuates* it. And he calls upon Mr. Goodall to disprove it. This is the very *policy* of literature, the joint device of prudence and of fear. But what is Mr. Goodall called upon to prove, in order to disprove that? He is to show, that “the French letters, as we now have them, are a true copy of those that were produced by Murray and his party, in the Scottish parliament, and at York and Westminster.” This indeed would be a labour for Hercules. This would be a task for Jupiter himself. It would be to prove, what I have historically disproved. It would be to prove, in contradiction to FACTS themselves. And I have already shown it would be this, by showing the copy presented to the parliament, and produced at York, NOT to be French at all. So little had Dr. Robertson attended to the HISTORY of the letters!

* Mr. Hume and Dr. Robertson have not even the *intellectual* merit, of *inventing* this poor subterfuge. It was first suggested by Mr. Goodall himself. He foresaw and exposed it. And yet these two fellow-labourers in the cause were so much distressed, that they condescended to take up this objection from him. See Goodall, i. 99—102.

But both he and Mr. Hume expressly acknowledge the *present* French, to be a translation from the Scotch, and, what is much more, a translation through the medium of the Latin. Mr. Hume assumes it, as a certain principle. Dr. Robertson adds, that he never knew any person to deny it. Yet who taught this principle to them both? MR. GOODALL. Who proved the certainty of it to them both? MR. GOODALL. From the publication of the French letters, to the very day of Mr. Goodall's writing concerning them; the published French had been taken by all, to be the very original of the whole. Mr. Goodall demonstrated this universal belief, to be false in itself. Conviction flashed upon all the thinking and ingenuous part of the nation. But there were some MOLES in criticism, it seems; who had been long in the habit of throwing up dirt against Mary; to whom the light was peculiarly painful; who therefore took refuge from it again in darkness, and there began to throw up their dirt again. The divine and the sceptick united together, to treat the intelligence which they acquired from Mr. Goodall's reasoning, just as scepticks are very apt to treat the knowledge, which they derive from scripture; to admit what they cannot deny, to appropriate all without any acknowledgment, and then to turn their borrowed science against the very lender of it. Mr. Hume and the Doctor secretly renounced all their former errors, under the impression of Mr. Goodall's arguments. And they then pretended, that these errors had never existed in their or any other heads,

heads, at all. Mr. Hume silently pretends it, and Dr. Robertson openly. With an affectation of liveliness to colour over a want of candour, the latter lets his spirits ferment; till at last they break out in the very extreme of dissingenuousness. “So far as I know,” he cries at the end, “no man ever denied” the present French copy, to be only a translation from the Scotch. But did any man ever *assert* it, *before* Mr. Goodall? The doctrine of gravitation, “so far as I know,” was never denied by any man. But was it ever affirmed *before* Sir Isaac Newton? And would it not reflect dishonour upon the spirit of a philosopher at present, a disciple (we will suppose) of Mr. Hutcheson’s: if feeling too powerfully the weight of Sir Isaac’s arguments, for the credit of his understanding, to deny assent to his conclusions; he should yet take shelter from conviction in littleness, should catch at some pretended hints of gravitation in an ancient authour, and then exclaim with an *acted* admiration at the proofs in the real discoverer, that “he might have saved himself the labour of so many criticisms,” and that, “so far as he knew, no person had ever denied” the doctrine?

But *is* the French copy that we have at present, say, or mean to say, these confessors and martyrs for political prejudice; the very same, with the copy produced by Murray at Westminster? And *is* the Scotch copy that we have at present, *I* add, the very same that was exhibited by him at York? The one may be questioned, as well as the other. Some anti-confessor or anti-martyr to the same

fort of prejudice, may determine the question as affirmatively on the one side, as they have done it on the other. And how shall we, who are not for being confessors or martyrs to either, be able to determine betwixt them? One answer will be effectual to both. We have some remains, as Dr. Robertson himself allows, of the *French* copy that was exhibited by Murray. We have also some remains, as every one must allow, of the *Scotch* copy exhibited by him. “In the Scottish translation of the Detection,” says the Doctor, “two or three sentences of the original French, were prefixed to each letter; which breaking off with an &c. the Scottish translation of the whole followed*.” And I have already given some passages out of the original Scotch, which the commissioners at York have afforded me. But are these passages, and these sentences, *greatly* different from those in the present copies? No! Are they different in any *one important word*? No! They are nearly to a word the same in *Scotch*. They are actually the same to a word in *French*. This Dr. Robertson himself admits. And where therefore, in the name of common-sense, can a possibility of doubt be lodged? No where within the regions of *common-sense*. But in that refinement of understanding, which is only the result of dissingenuousness; and which is a kind of intellectual juggle, that an uncandid mind exercises upon itself; there will still be scope for evasion. These passages, so exactly

* Diff. 31.

the same in the Doctor's pretended original, and the present copy, of the French, *may* have been, he will be bold to suppose; and actually *were*, he will be more bold to assert; taken from that original into the present copy, and so came to be exactly the same in both. "The French editor, the Doctor tells us, "laid hold of these sentences, "and tacked his own translation to them*." And the extracts from the Scotch may be also asserted, by an antagonist of equal bravery, if such a one can be met with; to have been equally borrowed by the present copy, from the letters of the commissioners at York, and for that reason to be so entirely conformable in both. When the human mind once puts itself under the dominion of chicanery, it is constantly punished by its own folly. Its vigour is debilitated by its fraudulence. The strength of the lion, sinks away into the wily weakness of the fox. And, in the just retributions of Providence, the dishonesty is repaid by ridiculousness.

This will appear still more strongly, if we consider the conduct of these brother-champions for credulity, in another view. They are eminent patterns of that very credulity, which they want to enforce upon us. They want to fix our faith upon an imaginary copy of the French letters, which once (they say) existed upon earth, but is now *in nubibus*; or rather is mounted to the moon,

As all things lost on earth are treasured there.

There it is secure from all the calamities of life.

* Diff. 34.

No critick eye can follow it thither, and expose its pretensions to originality. It there may rest with all its infirmities about it, safe from the GOODALLS of every age. And every one must applaud the wisdom of these gentlemen, in the sudden *translation* of the original to such a state of repose; just at a time, when the voice of war was beginning to disturb it in its old possessions, and to threaten even its very existence. But alas! all human wisdom is greatly tempered with folly. In this act of prudent attention to one point of the charge against Mary, they forget another. In their zeal to lodge the French original in some unknown sphere, they deprive themselves of any original at all. The present Scotch is merely a version. The present French is also a version. And the present Latin is equally one, with both. The Scotch is also asserted by Messieurs Robertson and Hume, to be very faulty. The Latin is allowed by them, to be still more so. And the great faultiness of the French, is their principal argument for its spuriousness. All may be exceedingly vitiated. Each certainly differs from the other. This argues all to have been strangely corrupted, as we have no original for the trial of any. The French, particularly, we know to talk egregious nonsense at times. It changes Mary's *letter of adultery* into her BIBLE; that edition of it anticipated (I suppose), in which the commandment ran, "thou *shalt* commit adultery." It confounds her letter again, with her *first day's journey*; and so makes her to promise, with a happy Hibernism, to *finish this her first day's*

day's journey the NEXT DAY. It even mistakes *irkit* for *nakit*; strips the delicate Queen in the month of January, and at the hour of midnight; and keeps her in this situation “*toute nuë*,” without even the cover of a smock upon her, writing a long letter to her lover. How can we rely then, upon the testimony of such a blundering witness as this? And, what is more, as the Scotch can depose to what it knows at second hand only, so the Latin and the French can attest only at third and at fourth hand. The original French transmitted its intelligence, to the Scotch; the Scotch imparted it to the Latin; and the Latin communicated it to the bastard French. To such hearsay, such vitiated, and such contradictory evidences, are we now reduced; by dispatching the original away from earth. And, with such a preposterous policy, have these two advocates for the letters been labouring to defend their genuineness; that they have almost annihilated their credibility.

Nor can I refrain from adding one observation more, in the same strain; in order to chastise properly this uncandid spirit of argumentation, in Dr. Robertson particularly. He objects to Mr. Goodall the circuitous route, which his remarks upon the three translations showed to have been taken, in the French being translated from the Latin and the Scotch successively. Mr. Goodall, he says, “accounts for THIS STRANGE SUCCESSION OF TRANSLATIONS, by supposing that “when the forgery was projected, no person could “be found capable of writing originally in the “French

“ French language, letters which would pass for
“ the Queen’s : for that reason they were first
“ composed in Scottish : but unluckily the French
“ interpreter, it would seem, did not understand
“ that language ; and therefore Buchanan trans-
“ lated them into Latin, and from his Latin they
“ were rendered into French. Goodall, i. 79,
“ 80.” I have assigned a reason, for there being
both a *Scotch* and a *French* copy of the letters ;
that is very different from this, and more *histro-
rical*. “ It is scarce necessary to observe, that
“ no proof whatever is produced of any of these
“ suppositions.” The Doctor here speaks at the
best, with an unguarded amplitude of expression ;
as the main suppositions are all proved demon-
stratively, that the letters were first composed in
Scotch, that they were thence translated into
Latin, and that from the Latin they were again
translated into French. “ The manners of the
“ Scots in that age, when almost every man of
“ rank spent a part of his youth in France, and
“ the intercourse between the two nations was
“ great, render it altogether improbable” [as
if the FACT was not plain] ; that so many com-
“ plicated operations should be necessary, in order
“ to procure a few letters to be written in the
“ French language*.” Yet how does Dr. Ro-
bertson mend the matter ? Instead of “ this
“ strange succession of translations,” he has re-
duced us, no doubt, to one single translation ; or
perhaps has overleaped them all, and carried us

* Diff. 29—30.

to the original at once. And “so many complicated operations” will thus be discharged for ever, by that simplifying principle of understanding, which is the peculiar happiness of genius. Yet, when we come to examine, we find ourselves disappointed. The “many complicated operations” are still left at work. The “strange succession of translations” is still continued on the file. And all these objections to Mr. Goodall’s system, stand in *equal* force against *his own*.

But is this possible to be true, with a writer of Dr. Robertson’s reputation? It is not only possible. It is actually true. And, even upon the Doctor’s *own* hypothesis, the present French *was* translated from the present Latin, and the present Latin *was* translated from the present Scotch. “This French translator,” says Dr. Robertson afterwards, “does not pretend to publish the original French letters, as written by the Queen herself; he expressly declares that he translated them from the Latin. Goodall, i. 103. Had our authour attended to all these circumstances,” this and others, “he might have saved himself the labour of so many criticisms, to prove that the present French copy of the letters is a translation from the Latin. The French editor himself acknowledges it, and so far as I know no person ever denied it*.” We are therefore left by the Doctor upon the old ground of “improbability,” on which he pretended to take us up.

* Diff. 29.

But,

But, what is much more, we are actually left upon it, with an *additional* load of “improbability” on our shoulders. The very chain of absurdity, of which the Doctor complains, is *lengthened* by him almost while he is complaining, and actually receives *an addition of one link more from his hands*. Before, the Scotch was the original, and the Latin and French were progressively translations from it. Now, the Scotch is equally a translation with the Latin and French, and all mediately or immediately from a new original of the Doctor’s own fabrication in French. We have thus one step more added to the flight before ; and by the very artist who laughed at the number before, and who pretended to make the approach with fewer. Such was the promise, and such is the performance, in this curious specimen of literary quackery !

Yet this is not all. The reason assigned, why the French copy of the letters could not be thus a translation from the Scotch through the Latin, the reflection of the reflection of a rainbow ; is this. At that time, says the Doctor, “almost every man of rank spent a part of his youth in France,” and “the intercourse between the two nations was great.” “These,” the Doctor adds, “render it altogether improbable, that so many complicated operations should be necessary, in order to procure a few letters to be *written* in the French language.” Yet, at that very time, these very operations were used, by the Doctor’s *own* account, to procure a few letters to be *translated* into the French language.

And,

And, what is the crowning part of the contradiction, these very operations were used to procure a French translation, *when* there was a French original existing at the very time, and *when* this original had been written without such a complexity of operations.

But I will push the good Doctor no farther. Theology and history owe too much to him, to let him be pressed too sharply, even when he is most wanton in his attacks, and most weak in his weapons. And I go on to observe, that the FACTS, which I have previously stated, *preclude* all this frantick hypothesis of an original, which was just seen, and then ascended to the clouds; and which was only seen by Dr. Robertson in its flight upwards,

As Rome's great founder to the Heavens withdrew,
To Proculus alone confess'd in view.

The letters were originally Scotch for sixteen months together, from June 1567, when they were pretended to be found, to October 1568, when they were produced to the commissioners at York. They were then, and not till then, translated into French. In French they appeared at Westminster, on the 8th of December following. And, as the translation had been awkwardly made, they betrayed their Scotch extraction so plainly, under all their French disguise; that, after Mr. Goodall had pointed it out, his boldest adversaries could not deny it, and were driven by it into a most extravagant supposition, *a kind of subtle æther, or nature's abhorrence of a vacuum*, or some such speculation of dreaming reason.

The

The original fabricator of the letters, has been long conjectured to be the celebrated Buchanan ; a man with a head qualified for any department in literature, but with a heart ready for any practice of villainy ; and actually one of the assistants to the rebel commissioners, in the conferences at York and Westminster *. But I have shown them to have been pretty certainly fabricated by Lethington, who is witnessed expressly by two cotemporary authours, to have forged the handwriting of Mary frequently † ; who seemed to love wickedness, for the insidiousness which it enabled him to exercise ; who practised all the frauds of villainy, merely to show the dexterity of his genius in managing them ; and had such an habitual propensity to intrigues, that he plotted against Mary, plotted against Murray, and plotted against all who had any connection with him. And the version of the Scotch letters into French, should naturally have been the task of Buchanan ; as of Lethington again, to transcribe them. Buchanan had spent many years in France ‡, and was peculiarly adapted for the work from his knowledge of both languages. Yet it is plain, that he was not employed in it. The translation was plainly committed to a person, who was totally incompetent to the making of it. This man *was compelled to translate the Scotch, by the*

* Goodall, ii. 109, 140, and 307.

† Crawford, 114 ; and Camden's Annals, translation, 116, and original, i. 143—144.

‡ See his life written by himself, and prefixed to Ruddiman's edition of his works.

interposition of a Latin copy. Buchanan, with the indolence of a studious man, with the pride of a scholar, or rather with the insolence of a half-commissioner*, devolved the mechanical employ upon another. He did so afterwards, when he published his own *Detectio Mariæ* in French. That *he* mediately or immediately published this edition of his Detection in French, and consequently published the French copy of the letters, which was inserted in it; is plain from positive evidence at the time. Blackwood, “who next
 “to Lesley was the best informed of all Mary’s ad-
 “vocates in that age,” as Dr. Robertson himself allows †; and who was so, principally, because he was entrusted with all the papers of Mary’s embassadour in France ‡; speaks in these terms of
 “Buchanan, homme ingrat, et desloyal:—IL a
 “depuis adjousté a cette declamation,” the Detection, “un petit libelle du pretendu mariage
 “du Duc de Norfolk, et de la facon de son pro-
 “ces, et le tout envoyé” into France.—But he had previously looked out for a Frenchman, to make the translation. This we equally know from a cotemporary writer. “I celuy,” says the authour of *Innocence de Marie*, printed in 1572, concerning the Detection, “premierement
 “composé (comme il semble) par George Buc-
 “chanan, Escossoys, et depuis traduit en langue

* He actually represents himself to have been a commissioner, when he was only an assistant to the commissioners, and when even *Lethington* was no more. Hist. xix. 372.

† Diss. 30, and Jebb, ii. 256.

‡ Jebb, ii. Preface, and Keith, App. 146.

“Francoise par un Huguenot *.” It was published in Latin at London, as I have formerly shown, about the end of October 1571. And it was re-published at London in French, on the 13th of February 1572 †. But he did so in a point, that comes still nearer to our present one. He had most probably drawn up the sonnets in French, himself. Yet he left the translation of them into Scotch, to another. He left it to some poor wretch, who seems to have understood neither Scotch nor French, and who has actually made his translation a chaos of both and of neither. So consistently careless does Buchanan appear, in both these operations! And so little stress of seriousness did he and his associates lay, upon the sonnets and letters at the time; though succeeding generations have taken them up with respect, and have treated them with reverence!

Yet who was the person engaged by Buchanan, in translating the Scotch letters into French, for the conference at Westminster? The very same, I suppose, who was employed by him in translating his *Detection* afterwards. This is highly probable in itself. But, when we consider another circumstance, it becomes more than probable. The very man, who translated the *Detection* into French, *published the letters translated with it*; and not merely the three, that were in the original *Detection*, but *all*. To the original three of his authour, he added not all the other five,

* Jebb, i. 425.

† Goodall, i. 38; and Tytler, 72—73.

but only four of them; as, from some accident, a great part of the French eighth was lost. And this translation of his is the very same with that, to which the Scotch original, after the conference at Westminster, was obliged to rank as a translation; is the very same that we have at present; and is the only French copy, actually known or morally possible to have existed at all.

What then was the name of this authour? Let the anonymous cotemporary, whom I cited before, tell us. He was “un Huguenot, Poitevin
“ (advocat de vocation) CAMUZ, soy disant gen-
“ tilhomme, et un de plus remarquez seditieux
“ de France*.” And as we may conclude from a blunder in Blackwood, who makes the version to have been formed and printed at ROCHELLE in France †, though it was demonstrably printed in London; he was one of the advocates and protestants of Rochelle, that celebrated capital of protestantism to the year 1628. To this man, pretty certainly, did Buchanan consign the task, of making Mary’s letters unlearn their native Scotch, and speak in the language of France at last. Camuz was a refugee for his religion. He had nobly renounced his country, resigned his profession, and devoted himself to poverty and exile. The authour of *Innocence de Marie* therefore, with the low turn of men that fix felicity in wealth, hints at his poverty in questioning his gentility. But he was also one of those champions for religion, who brought one of the worst

* Jebb, i. 425.

† Ibid. ii. 256.

principles of popery, into the bosom of protestantism; who were just as ready to sacrifice all the laws of morality for the one, as the papists were for the other; and who stained the bright annals of the reformation, with rebellion and sacrilege, with perjury and forgery, with usurpation, devastation, and murders. And his engaging in this *pious fraud* of forgery against Mary, shows his exile not to have civilized the religious barbarity of his principles, not to have tamed him into a peaceable citizen, and not to have humanized him into an honest man. He was still a knave. But then he was a knave for protestantism still. And, as such, he was a fit instrument to be employed, in this dark work of assassination upon the good name of Mary. He was perhaps recommended by Cecil himself, for the employ. Since we have seen the change of the very language, carried on by such a gross collusion with Elizabeth and Elizabeth's ministers; we can have no doubt, but she, or Cecil, or both, were privy to all the management of the change. And the man must certainly have been employed by Cecil afterwards, in publishing the French copy of the letters from his office.

But, after all, Camuz had one great deficiency of knowledge for the work. He was ignorant of the Scottish language; that language, in which the letters had been hitherto written; and that, from which he was now to translate them into French. This indeed was a deficiency of a capital nature. How shall it be supplied? In the same way, that some of his countrymen since,
are

are said to have supplied their ignorance of Homer's Greek; by translating from a Latin copy. His education for his professional employ, had given him a sufficient acquaintance, with the universal language of European literature. And a Latin copy must be substituted to him, in the room of the Scotch. This was done accordingly. Buchanan had probably turned the letters into Latin already, with a view to that publication of them in his Latin Detection, which he made about three years afterward. In this work he should naturally have inserted them all, though he inserted only three. He plainly meant from his manner to have inserted all *. And he actually presented the work to Elizabeth, and to her commissioners, in form; at the Westminster

* In Jebb, i. 254—255, he appeals thus to the *first* letter: "Legite ipsius epistolam; epistolam, inquam, ipsius manu scriptam." He then quotes a passage out of it. In 259 he refers to the *third* thus: "Ex ejus epistolâ facillè potest colligi, in quâ," &c. And in 266 he thus appeals to *all* the letters from *Glasgow*: "Quibus indiciis, testimoniis, literis ipsius reginæ, tota res teneatur." Just in the same language, he refers to *all* the letters from *Stirling*. In 248 he says: "Volens-ne an invita" Mary was carried away by Bothwell, "ex literis ad eum ex itinere scriptis facillè quivis intelliget." Just so in 243 he says: "Quæ autem fuerit illius profectionis" to *Glasgow* "causa, facillè ex literis ejus ad Bothuelium quivis intelligat." The letters from *Stirling*, therefore, he equally meant to have published in Latin, with the letters from *Glasgow*. And he accordingly published what he did publish, expressly as "literæ Reginæ Scotiæ ad Comitem Bothuelium scriptæ," or (in the words of the English translation at the time) as "the—letteris found in the—casket" (Jebb, i. 270, and Anderson, ii. 110).

conference *. This Latin copy he communicated to Camuz. The unprincipled refugee went to work, upon this secondary original. He translated as the Latin read. And, as the Latin had read falsely in various places, it drew Camuz and his French copy into various falsehoods. Some of these Buchanan saw and corrected, before he published his Detection and three letters in Latin. Some other person saw and corrected others. And this has produced a slight train of variations, betwixt the Latin and the French of those authors †.

Thus translated, the French letters appeared at Westminster as the true originals. Drest up in the second-hand livery of Camuz, they strutted with all the dignity of their masters, assumed the honour of their names, and mocked at all subordination to them. And succeeding times were so little acquainted, with the discriminating marks between the port of a lord and the step of his valet; that they received the one for the other, took the valet into the drawing-room, and left the lord in the servant's hall.

But, when Camuz came afterwards to publish the French edition of the Detection for Buchanan, he acknowledged the imposition, which had been put upon the commissioners at Westminster; with all that serenity of impudence, with which Murray had changed the Scotch of the letters into French before. “Au reste,” he said to the reader, “les

* Camden's Annals, translation, 117, and original, 144.

† See next volume for them.

“ epistres mises sur la fin,” which were all the letters except the eighth, “ avoient esté écrites
 “ par la Royne, partie en Francois partie en
 “ Escossois; et depuis traduites entierement en
 “ Latin : mais n’ayant cognoissance de la langue
 “ Escossoise, j’ay mieux aimé exprimer tout ce
 “ que j’ay trouvé en Latin; que me montrant
 “ trop scrupuleux au changement d’une syllabe,
 “ te frustrer de l’esclaircissement que tu y auras,
 “ pour cognoistre a qui la faute de l’exécrable
 “ meurtre, et autres enormitez y contenues,
 “ doivent estre imputées *.” In this account of his work, Camuz appears as unprincipled as Buchanan himself, and worthy to rank as a translator to such an authour. He had turned the Scotch letters into French. He knew therefore the imputed manufacture of Mary, to be *his own* fabrication. Yet he supports the forgery. He acknowledges, he had translated the letters into French himself. Yet he supports the forgery still. So thoroughly were all the workings of grace, all the suggestions of natural conscience, and even all the motions of modesty, overborne in his soul by a villainy, that usurped the title of religion !

He says however, that he translated the letters into French, not from the Scotch immediately, because he was ignorant of the Scottish language; but mediately through the Latin. He thus tells

* Goodall, i. 103. The French preface to the French Detection and Letters, is very strangely omitted by Jebb, i. 281.

all, that Mr. Goodall discovered near two hundred years afterward. But he told it, because he thought it would be discovered. He had begun to be aware, that he had been led into some mistakes by the Latin. He therefore tells us of his original. And he intimates his suspicion expressly, that the Latin had not been “too scrupulous in the change of a syllable.” But, if he had “no knowledge of the Scottish language,” and was therefore forced to take “what he found “in Latin;” then the letters were originally written in SCOTCH. This is plain. It is plain from his own account. And the letters appear from his own confession, from the tenour and the terms of it, to have been all in SCOTCH; when he began to translate them. He *therefore* provided himself, with a Latin version of them. This was not confined, as has been hitherto understood, to the *three* which Buchanan published in Latin. If it had been, Camuz could never have translated the other five. It comprised *all the eight*. Hence all the eight appeared in French at Westminster. Hence also all the eight were published by Camuz in French afterwards, except only one which had been accidentally lost. And Camuz expressly tells us, that he had a Latin copy of all the eight before him at the time, and that he translated all the eight from it into French. The letters, he says, were “traduictes “ENTIEREMENT en Latin;” and I, he adds concerning himself, have expressed in French “TOUT “ce que j’ay TROUVE EN LATIN.”

But

But Camuz also says, that the letters which he published, were “*escrites par la Royne, partie en*” “*Francois, partie en Escossois; et depuis tra-*” “*duictes entierement en Latin.*” This Dr. Robertson interprets into an affirmation, “that” “Mary had written these letters, *partly* in French, “*partly* in Scottish*.” The Doctor also endeavours to account for it, by a supposition of his own, which is even more extravagant than the imputed assertion of his authour. He supposes him to have taken his idea, of the letters being written *partly* in Scotch and *partly* in French; from the incident of the Scotch letters, carrying a few words of the French at the head of each. How such an incident, even under any misconceptions of ignorance, could have given rise to such a supposition; it is difficult to say. But the difficulty is doubled, when we reflect on what the Doctor himself allows; that “this method of” “printing *translations*, was not uncommon in that” “age †.” And the difficulty is mounted up into an impossibility, when we additionally reflect; that these very Scotch letters expressly declared themselves, to *be a translation* from the French. In conformity to the last exhibition of the letters in French, the published Scotch hypocritically professed itself, to be merely a version from the French, and to be made word for word from it ‡. But the real fact is this, undisguised by hypothetical reasonings, and unobscured by pretended illuminations. Camuz speaks of the eight letters,

* Diff. 31.

† Ibid. 32.

‡ Detection, 129.

not as written *partly* in French, and *partly* in Scotch; a mode of composing them, which is equally ridiculous and false; but as composed *some* in French and *some* in Scotch, and *all* translated into Latin. He speaks not with a strict accuracy, or a full consistency. But he plainly alludes to a *fact*. He alludes to the appearance of *six* letters in *Scotch* at York, of *five* in *French* at Westminster, of *sundry* in *Scotch*, and of *eight* in *French*, there. He was confounded by the complexity of these backward and forward movements, this “cycle in epicycle, orb in orb.” He probably knew them imperfectly. He certainly comprehended them indistinctly. He therefore speaks confusedly of them, as if *some* of *his own eight* had been written by Mary herself in *Scotch*, and *some* in *French*. And he therefore runs himself into a contradiction, as if one or more of the letters had been originally composed in French; when he owns they were *all* in *Scotch*, when he confesses they were *all* translated out of *Scotch* into Latin, and when he acknowledges that *he himself* translated them into French from the one, because he was unacquainted with the other. His information struggling in his mind with his knowledge, the notices derived from others with the certainties acquired by his own experience; he related both just as they stood before him, and found himself unable to reconcile them. But we can do what he could not. — We first take what he must certainly know, *his own conduct*; his translating the letters into French, his finding them only in Scotch, his being ignorant of this language,

language, his procuring a Latin version, and his turning the Latin into French. These facts being certain, we can ascertain the others by them. As he found the letters only in Scotch, and as he translated them mediately from Scotch into French; there could not possibly be a French copy antecedent to the Scotch, and there could only be a Scotch one. We also know the fact to be so, independently of his testimony. His testimony, and the fact, now unite together. And Camuz appears from both, clear in what lay within the compass of his own knowledge, confused only in what he had gained from information, confused by his misapprehension of some facts related to him, so making them run counter a little to his own experience, and writing equally with a betraying explicitness concerning all.

I have thus stated to my reader the whole history of this French translation, as far as we can trace it by its own records. It is, we see, in a very near correspondency with the facts before. Had it not been, it must have been overborne by them. But, as it is, it serves to confirm them. And it unites with them to show, that the Scotch was the original to Murray's French, that the Scotch was the original to Camuz's, and that the French of both was as much the same as the Scotch of both. By the final resolution for a French copy of the letters, Murray ventured upon an enormous audacity of impudence, that endangered his whole system. By the consignment of the translation to Camuz, he risked a disclosure of his knavery from the new confederate.

confederate. By the badness of Camuz's translation, he actually betrayed the knavery to the penetrating eyes of a critick, in Mr. Goodall; and so gave occasion to the first detection of the letters, that had been hitherto made through a course of nearly two hundred years. And, by the journals of the commissioners, he also furnished me with a proof of the whole forgery, that lay much more obvious to the common eye, that however had lain even more unnoticed than the other, and that greatly heightens the evidence against the authenticity of the letters *.

BUT

* In this French edition of the Detection, printed in February 1572, and about three or four months after the Latin and the English editions; and particularly in that additional supplement to it, which was not in the Latin edition, but was first published in the English, and thence taken into the French; were many errors concerning names and words, that were evidently derived from the English. "Blak Maister" "Johne Spens," a person so called (as I have observed before) from his dark complexion, is made into two men, "Blac-Maistre," and "Jean Spens" (Detection, iii. and Jebb, i. 330). The translator thus misinterpreted the word "Maister," into a regular surname. He had even given the misinterpretation before. He had then given it with an interpolation of his own, in order to lend a colouring of sense to his erroneous construction. "Andro Maister of Arrole" he turned into "André Maister, Sieur d'Errole" (104 and 327). "Eleok" was changed, in both the French and the English, into "Chok" (97 and 324); "Kinros" into "Kinrof" in the English, and "Rinrof" in the French (104 and 327); "Hereis" into "Hereif," English, and "Heierif," French; "Lochinwar" into "Lothinwar," English, and "Bothin-war," French; and "Barnebowgal" into "Berne Buxal" and

§ VIII.

BUT there is one point more which I wish to explain, before I close the chapter and the argument

and “Vernée Bruxal” (112 and 331). “Johne Hammiltoun, commendater of Arbroith,” was by a slight elision reduced into a “commander” in English, and appears as “Jean Hambleton commandeur de Arbroycht” in French (112 and 331). “At quhilk tyme” was, by as slight a substitution, made “all quhilk tyme” in English, and “de tout temps” in French; was taken in both, from the head of a sentence; and was placed by both, in the middle of one (105 and 327). “The langer dirt is hiddin, it is the stranger,” was by a casual misprint of the English turned, in the leading word, into “deirt;” was interpreted to mean *dearth*; and was rendered in French thus, “d’autant plus qu’on cache la *faim*, d’autant plus elle s’augmente” (160 and 351). “*Hindmest* he confessit” became “Hinmest” in English, then rose astonishingly into a person, and appeared “*Hineft* confessa” in French (160 and 351). “Nouthier,” which had been invariably printed “neither” before, being accidentally left in its native form at one place, was supposed to be “no uthier,” and to have lost its accompanying word “time;” and was therefore translated, with a wild perversion of the sense, “fussent forclos *cy apres* a produire,” &c. (113 and 331). And, to close this long bead-roll of blunders, that technical idiom of the Scotch law, “art and part,” was three times metamorphosed in English into “acte & part,” and in French into “acte” only for the two first times, the words “& part” being rejected, as impossible to be moulded to any meaning with the other; and into “en tout et en partie” afterwards, the latter half being now retained, and the former moulded into a conformity with it (103 and 326, 105 and 327, and 113 and 331): and that technical term of law, “dittay,” was turned into “adjourne-ment” and “ajournement” at first, then into “signifiées,” as applied to “lettres,” then into “proces,” and finally into

argument together. I have now traced the French copy, from its origin to its publication. I wish also

into "accusation" (103 and 326, 103 and 327, 113 and 331, and 113 and 331 again).

Mr. Goodall was the first who observed these, and a thousand errors besides, which had passed unnoticed in the history of the letters, for one hundred and eighty years before (i. 107—113). But he drew a conclusion from these, which was very natural indeed, and yet was not just. The same blunders existing nearly in the same form, within the English and the French editions of the Detection; he presumed them to have been derived into the French, immediately from the English. And he inferred the French translator to have actually known the English language, though he expressly declares himself to have been ignorant of it.

But this reasoning is not accurate. It is founded upon a false assumption. It consequently partakes of the falsehood of that. The blunders may have been transmitted, *mediately*, from the English to the French. They may have been transmitted, through the interposition of the Latin. A Latin translation was actually interposed, in three of the letters. This was even executed by the hand of a Buchanan. Yet it is replete with mistakes. And it has transplanted them all into the French. This therefore stands as a strong argument of analogy, that the same medium was equally used in the additional supplement. A meaner hand than Buchanan's was engaged, in translating this. The translator was probably an Englishman; and therefore not so well acquainted as Buchanan necessarily was, with those peculiarities of words and idioms, which distinguish the language of Northern Britain from that of the Southern. He therefore misunderstood them. He was not conversant too with those titular and personal appellations, which discriminate the lords and knights of Scotland from those of England. He therefore misspelled them. The French historians often do so, to the present day; and disfigure the names of foreigners in such a wonderful manner, that the foreigners can hardly know themselves again, under the strange disguise. Then the imperfections of a
press,

also to trace the Scotch. This alone is requisite, to wind up the whole of my reasoning here, completely.

press, in that age negligent and inaccurate beyond any example of modern times, created some mistakes, which a translator was obliged to copy, because he was unable to correct; and multiplied others, by giving scope to conjectural readings, whenever ignorance found itself perplexed. All would be taken into the Latin translation, and all would be preserved in the French. Some would even be added, and some would even be improved, by both. This we know to have been actually the case in the letters. And as the French translator expressly declares himself to have been ignorant of the Scottish (or English) language, and to have therefore translated the letters from the Latin; and as this ignorance must have extended to the additional supplement, equally with the letters themselves: we have a decisive evidence, that he translated the letters and the supplement, equally from a Latin copy; and that all the deformities of the English, which are reflected in the French, are reflected through the mirror of the Latin.

One of the very deformities above, coincides with all this, and confirms it all. We have seen the Scotch "dittay" translated "adjournement" and "ajournement," then "signifiées," then "proces," and finally "accusation." Nor did the French translator, as Mr. Goodall thinks (i. 113), see "at last" the true meaning of the word, *because* it was coupled with "inditement," and so give us "accusation" as an equivalent to it. He found it thus coupled "at last" in 114, and translated it "accusation" in 332. But he had previously found it uncoupled in 113, and yet had translated it "accusation" in 331. He had even found it coupled before in 97, but had actually rendered it "adjournement" in 323. And, what is still more, he had even found the words "ze ar indytit" in 103, and had rendered them "[vous] etes adjourné" in 326. He plainly therefore derived not his information of the meaning, from any accompanying explanations in the English copy. He had no accompanying explanations

pletely. I shall therefore go back to some circumstances in its history, which I have not dwelt upon sufficiently before. And the demonstrated fact of its originality, will lead us to some useful conclusions at the end of all.

When the second set of letters was fabricated, for the view of the parliament in December 1567 ;

explanations at all, in the copy from which he translated. "Dittay or inditement" in 114, and also in 97, were rendered by one word in his copy, and were therefore answered by one word in his version, both in 332 and 323. "Indited" was also replied to by a word of the same family with "dittay," and was therefore echoed back in "adjournée," as "dittay" was in "adjournement." The French translator knew nothing, either of the variation or of the explication in the English copy. There was neither explication nor variation in his copy. And he drew his final intelligence from another source. He drew it all from a copy in Latin. In the Latin alone could be the word, that would answer all his various explications. The word "dittay," and the words "dittay or inditement," would very naturally be translated "dictum" in the Latin. "Ze ar indytit" would as naturally, and more elegantly, be translated, "vobis dies dicitur." And all would be translated into "adjournement" and "adjourné" in French. Nor is this merely an airy surmise. We see it reduced to act. In the first letter, the words "he was chargeit to ane day of law," which in the Latin are "*ut causam diceret accersitum*," are in French "*il estoit adjourné*" (Sect. iv). This corresponds pretty closely with "adjourné" for "indited," and with "adjournement" for "dittay." But, in the second letter, "ane day of law" is "*dies dictus*" in Latin, and "jour assigné" in French (Sect. iv). This is equivalent to "nifiées" for "dittay" above. And "dictum" became ultimately "proces" and "accusation," from the light gradually breaking out of the context.

they

they were the same, as I have shown before, with the *ten* letters of the journal, and with the *sundry* letters of December the 7th, 1568. But my reader will be amazed to see me add at present, that they were also the same *with the famous eight themselves*. Yet so it is in fact. They were substantially, they were verbally, the same. I was long before I could perceive it. But the evidence at last proved too strong to be resisted. And what has convinced me, I must naturally presume, will equally convince my reader.

The account of the ten letters, is thus given us by the commissioners at Westminster. “This daye,” says their journal on the 8th of December, “the
 “Erle of Murray, according to the appointment
 “yesterday,” though no mention is made of the appointment in the journal of the day preceding,
 “came to the Quene’s Majestie’s commissioners,
 “saying: that as they had yesternight produced
 “and shewed sundry writings, tending to prove
 “the hatred which the Quene of Scotts bare
 “toward her husband, to the tyme of his murder;
 “wherin also, they said, might appear speciall
 “arguments of her inordinate love towards the
 “Erle Bothwell: so,” &c *. This is the description of the ten. Let us now turn to the account of that part of the eight, which was produced this day. “So,” says Murray in the journal concerning himself and his associates, “for the
 “further satisfaction both of the Quene’s Ma-
 “jestie and theyr lordships, they were ready to

* Appendix, No. viii.

“ produce and shew a great number of other letters
 “ wrytten by the said Quene; wherin, as
 “ they said, might appear very evidently her inordinate
 “ love towards the said Erle Bothwell, with
 “ fundry other arguments of her guiltynes of the
 “ murder of her husband.” These two pictures are
 so very like to each other, that, in *this* view of them,
 we hardly know which is our own. But we soon
 see it. “ And so therupon,” adds the journal,
 “ they produced seven several wrytings in French,
 “ in the lyke Romain hand as others her letters,
 “ which were shewed yesternight, and avowed
 “ by them to be wrytten by the said Quene;
 “ which seven wrytings, being copied, were read
 “ in French, and a due collation made therof”
 &c. Here we see distinctly, which were the
 present letters, and which were not. But, in the
 descriptions before, we could hardly do it.

So similar were they in their general nature! Let us now, therefore, attend to another circumstance in them. The letters of the rebel journal, consist of some from Glasgow before the murder, and some from Stirling after it. So did also the letters of the Scotch council and Scotch parliament. They were, says the book of the one and the act of the other, “ divers hir previe lettres
 “ writtin and subscrivit with her awen hand,” or
 “ writtin halelie with hir awin hand;” “ and sent
 “ by hir to James Erll Boithwell, cheiffe executor
 “ of the said horrible murdor, as well BEFORE
 “ the committing theirow, as THERAFTER *.” And

* Appendix, No. i. and ii.

the present letters are also the same, four before the murder, and four after it.

We can come, however, to much closer proofs of sameness. These are not in their general nature, or in their general dates. These are in their particular dates, in the very circumstances of their narrations, and in the very terms of their language. I have previously noticed this with another view, when I did not observe the full extent of the notice. And I must beg leave to go over it again, in order to enlarge and point it properly for my present argument. “Jan. 27th,” says the journal, “the Quene (conforme to HIR COMMISSION, as she WRYTTIS) brought the King from Glascow*.” The passage alluded to, is still in one of the letters, and runs thus: “According to MY COMMISSION I bring the man with me, &c †. It was originally in one of the ten, as the journal witnesses. It is now in one of the eight, as the fact shows. And the eight and the ten appear in this instance at least, relating the same intentions in the same language. This would be sufficient of itself, I believe, for the inference, which I mean to draw from the whole. I shall add others, however. “Jan. 23d,” says the journal, “the Quene came to Glascow, and on the rode met HIR *Thomas Crawford* from the Erle of Lennux, and Sir *James Hamilton*, with *the rest*, MENTIONIT IN HIR LETTER ‡.” All these circumstances were as much in the first of the ten letters then, as they

* Appendix, No. x. † L. ii. S. ii. ‡ Appendix, No. x.

are in the first of the eight at present. But the journal goes on. “Jan. 24,” it adds, “the Quene REMAYNIT AT GLASCOW, lyck as she did the 25th and the 26th; and hayd THE CONFERENCE WITH THE KING, whereof she WRYTIS*.” In the ten the Queen continued at Glasgow, just as long as she does in the eight: she being there, by the journal made for the ten, the 24th, 25th, and 26th of January: and she being also there, by the second of the eight, on Saturday, which was the 25th of January in that year†; being there, by the first, upon the day before and evening preceding, or Friday the 24th and Thursday the 23d; and, by the second again, intending to leave it upon Monday the 27th. But, as the journal proceeds, “in this tyme,” the 24th—26th, she “wrayt hir BYLLE and uther letteris to Bothwell‡.” She therefore appears from the journal, to have written such of her ten letters as were sent from Glasgow, on the 24th, 25th, and 26th of January. And she appears from the eight themselves, to have written also such of *them* as were equally sent from Glasgow, on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, the 24th—26th of that month. All this serves strongly, to prove the sameness of the letters. But the journal adds to the force of all, by referring to the same word, as her own appellation for the first of the ten, which is equally her own appellation for the first of the eight at present, BYLLE. And the Glasgow letters appear plainly to have

* Appendix, No. x.
Appendix, No. x.

† Goodall, i. 120, and
‡ Appendix, No. x.

been the same, in both these sets of epistles. Nor are the Stirling letters different. If one half is the same, the other, we may be sure, is the same also. But the journal equally shows it. “April
 “21st, viz. Mounday,” it says, “the Quene raid
 “to Stirling, AS IT WES DEVYSIT; and from
 “thence wreyt THE LETTERIS, CONCERNING
 “THE PURPOSE DEVYSIT OF HIR RAVISHING;
 “quhair Huntly CAM TO HIR, and BEGAN TO
 “REPENT HIM*.” The Stirling part of the ten spoke equally, as the Stirling part of the eight speaks now, of the journey to Stirling being previously agreed upon, betwixt Mary and Bothwell; of the design for seizing her, being settled betwixt them; of Huntly’s coming to her there; and of his beginning to repent of the part, which he had undertaken for the enterprize. And they are obviously, therefore, the same.

So fully do the eight and the ten, the letters of the Scotch council and parliament, the letters of the rebel journal, the letters of the 7th of December at Westminster, and the present letters, all assimilate together. They are equally from Stirling and from Glasgow. They are equally of the same general and particular dates, from both. They are of the same nature and substance. They relate the same facts, speak of the same agreements, and even use the same words. Yet there was a difference between them. I have marked it before. I now proceed to account for it. It was totally foreign to all these

* Appendix, No. x.

proofs of sameness. It no ways affects them. And it consisted in two letters more, which are not in the present set, but were in the former; and in some corrections that were made in the letters of both.

The ten are strikingly distinguished from the eight, by the letter from Linlithgow and the letter from Kirk-a-field. Of *that* the journal says: "Jan. 29th, she [the Queen] remayned all day
" in Linlythquow with the King, and WRAYTT
" FROM THENCE TO BOTHWELL*." Here then is a letter, one of the series of letters in the journal, which does not appear among the present. But there is also another. "Feb. 7th," says the journal, "she ludget and lay all nycht
" agane in the foresaid chalmer [the chamber
" under the King's]; and FROM THENCE wrayt
" THAT SAME NYCHT the LETTER, CONCERNING
" THE PURPOSE OF THE ABBOT OF HALYRUID-
" HOUSE. 8. She confronted the Kyng and my
" Lord of Halyruid-house, CONFORM TO HIR
" LETTER WRYTTIN THE NYCHT BEFOIR†." Here is also another letter of the journal series, which is equally non-apparent among the present. Both unite, in discriminating the present series from that of the journal. Both unite, in showing the journal to have been constructed for the ten. But then it was equally constructed for the eight too. These were eight of the very ten. And, these two being deducted from the ten, their number was directly reduced to eight.

* Appendix, No. x.

† Ibid. No. x.

In consequence of these two letters it is, that the ten are characterized by the rebels themselves, to the commissioners at Westminster; as “tending to prove the HATRED, which the Quene
 “of Scots bare toward her husband, TO THE
 “TYME OF HIS MURDER; *wherin* also, they said,
 “might appear speciall arguments, of her inor-
 “dinate love towards the Erle Bothwell.” And by the subtraction of these it is, that the eight are equally characterized by them at the same time; as showing “very evidently her inordinate
 “love towards the said Erle Bothwell, *with* fun-
 “dry other arguments of her guiltyness, of the
 “murder of her husband.” By the deduction of these two murderous letters from the rest, the Queen’s hatred for Darnly, which before stood prominent on the face of the whole, was taken away in the magnitude of it, and the adultery came stalking forward in its room.

The other note of difference between the two sets of letters, was this. Some corrections had been made in the letters of the journal. And some variations had been produced by them, betwixt the journal, the letters, and the truth.

Thus, when the journal refers to one of the letters, and cites some of the very words of it, for Mary’s conducting the King from Glasgow to Kalendar, to Linlithgow, and to Kirk-a-field; the letter itself exhibits the words, but carries the King by a very different route. I have shown this circumstantially, before. Yet it is requisite to bring the two passages together again, that the correction made in the letter since the

formation of the journal, may appear the more striking in itself, and may be properly accounted for now.

JOURNAL.

“ Jan. 27th, the Quene
 “ (conforme to hir commif-
 “ fion, as ſhe wryttis) broucht
 “ the King from Glaſcow
 “ to the Kalendar towards
 “ Edynbrough. Jan. 28th,
 “ the Quene broucht the
 “ King to Linlythquow—.
 “ 29th. She remayned all
 “ day in Linlythquow with
 “ the King—. 30th. The
 “ Quene broucht the King
 “ to Edynbrough, and patt
 “ him in his ludging quhair
 “ he endit.”

2d LETTER.

“ Howbeit I have na far-
 “ ther newis from zow, ac-
 “ cording to my commif-
 “ fioun, I bring the man with
 “ me to Craigmillar upon
 “ Monunday, quhair he
 “ will be all Wedniſday; and
 “ I will gang to Edinburgh,”
 &c.

Here the difference is very great. But it could not have been ſo, originally. The letter originally muſt have been, juſt as the journal quotes it. It muſt, equally with that, have conveyed the King from Glaſgow to the Kalendar on Monday January the 27th, have lodged him at Linlithgow on Tueſday and Wedneſday the 28th and 29th, and have carried him to Kirk-a-field on the 30th. But it now conducts him and her to Craigmillar on Monday, keeps them at Craigmillar all Tueſday and Wedneſday, and ſends her to Edinborough with him on Thurſday. This alteration is a very remarkable one. And it muſt ſtand

stand for ever, an evident proof of the whole forgery.

But it is the more remarkable, as we see the rebels, in the pretended depositions of Paris, recurring to the route of the journal again. “Comme elle,” says the silly forger of this silly confession concerning the Queen, “retournoit de Glasgow vers Lisleburg [Edinburgh] *, avec le Roy a KALLANDER,” &c. “Après le Royne et le Roy,” he adds afterwards, “estans a LYTHGOW,” &c. And, as he subjoins, “le Roy—ils conduirent jusques a son logis a KIRK-A-FIELD †.” All this marks the uncertainty and dubiousness of the rebels, concerning the route that they should take for the King and Queen, in very vivid colours. This uncertainty occasioned the correction of the letters, and the departure from the journal. This dubiousness again occasioned the depositions, to revolt from the letters, and desert to the journal. And we have thus three authentick documents, all equally furnished by the rebels, all equally stamped with the impress of their authority, and all in a state of hostility against them; their grand and capital document of all, opposing and being opposed by their formal journal upon one side, and being contradicted by, and contradictory to, their solemn depositions on the other.

Nor can the variation of the letter from the

* Edinburgh was called *Lisleburg* by the French, I suppose, from its peninsulated site on a large rock, that had a long neck of land leading up to it.

† Goodall, ii. 78, 79.

depositions and the journal, be accounted for by any supposition; that the course by Craigmillar was *intended* by the Queen, but that the route by Kalendar was *pursued* by her. Thomas Nelson indeed, one of the two witnesses whom the rebels produced at Westminster, to facts that proved nothing at all, concerning the perpetrators of the murder, says: he “remembris it was de-
“wyfed in Glasgow, that the King fuld haif lyne
“first at Craigmillar; bot, becaus he had na will
“theirow, the purpois was altered, and conclu-
“sioun takin, that he fuld ly besyde the Kirk-of-
“field *.” The rebels thus exhibited a testimony with the letters and the journal, that directly confronted them to their face. The letters did not *originally* choose the route by Craigmillar, and *afterwards* prefer the course by Kalendar. No! They originally took the road by Kalendar. They thus harmonized with the journal. And the reference of the journal to them, proves irrefragably that they did. But the route for Craigmillar was afterwards substituted, in the place of this. It was a new line of motion, that was posteriorly given to the letters. It was hastily taken up, and hastily abandoned again, by the rebels. It was adopted in preference to the line, already in the letters and journal. It was adopted in the letters, but forgotten to be adopted in the journal too. And it was afterwards abandoned in the depositions again, for the original and primary line still subsisting in the journal.

* Goodall, ii. 244.

This extraordinary instance of *oscillation* in the conduct of the rebels, is a full attestation of their roguery. Nor is it difficult to assign the reasons for their conduct. The real route pursued by the King and Queen I *believe*, but I cannot *prove*, to have been by Craigmillar to Kirk-a-field. This therefore should naturally have been followed for ever, by the letters. But a new suggestion of forgery prevented it. A resolution was taken, to write another letter for her from *Linlithgow* to Bothwell; in order to mark her concern decisively, in the coming murder. This therefore compelled the forger, to leave the line of truth and Craigmillar, and to move by the round of falsehood and Kalendar. And accordingly, as the journal still takes this round, and as the journal proves the letters to have equally taken it once; so the journal goes on, to give us an additional letter from Linlithgow. Such, I doubt not, was the reason for selecting the first route. In so acting, the rebels showed all that bold confidence in the credulity of the world, which characterizes so many of their actions. But afterwards this reason was withdrawn, and then this temerity was recalled. When the resolution was taken, to cut off the murderous evidence from the rest; the letter from Linlithgow was first suppressed. It was accordingly not shown, either at York or at Westminster. The letters therefore, which had been violently bent by the force of falsehood, into the circuitous course by Linlithgow; now returned, as it were by the natural elasticity of truth, into the straight line

line of Craigmillar. And the letters were actually exhibited in this new state, at York. But, when the confession of Paris came to be drawn up afterwards, a counter-resolution was taken, for adding again what had been cut off before, and even for enlarging the murderous evidence. The rebels did thus go on,

Downwards to climb, and backwards to advance !

The depositions, accordingly, bring forward a monstrous addition of murderous evidence. And they particularly dwell, upon the previously rejected letter from Linlithgow. So clearly have we found a reason, that runs, like a thread, through all the rebel curvatures of conduct, and becomes a kind of central pin to all their circumvolutions !

Thus were the rebels continually making alterations, in the letters; and thus did they make some, which now constitute the difference between the ten and the eight. In an unaltered state were the letters, at the meeting of the Scotch parliament. They were thus produced before it. But, in an altered one, they came to the conference at York. Then six of the ten were shown to the commissioners, as six probably had been shown to the parliament before. Three of these were from Glasgow, two from Stirling, and one from Kirk-a-field. So far did the rebels proceed in their original purpose, of exhibiting the murderous letters with the rest. They did so, in direct opposition to their present plan. Yet, with as direct
a con-

a conformity to it, they suppressed *another* of the murderous letters, that from Linlithgow. And they produced not *some* of the *others*; the fourth, which is from Glasgow, and the seventh and eighth, which are from Stirling. Nor was it before the conference at Westminster, that they resolved upon the retention of the two, from Linlithgow and Kirk-a-field, together. They thus exhibited only five, on the 8th of December at Westminster. But they had exhibited *sundry* the day before. “They had yesternight,” says the journal of the 8th, “produced and shewed SUN-
“ DRY WRYTINGS, tending to prove the hatred,” &c. These were written “in the lyke Romain
“ hand,” with the letters of the 8th; are spoken of expressly, as “her letters which were shewed
“ yesternight;” and were equally “avowed by
“ them, to be wrytten by the said Quene.” And thus they exhibited a set of letters in SCOTCH on the 7th, re-exhibited some of them in FRENCH on the 8th, asserted the one set to be totally different from the other, asserted both to be Mary’s handwriting, and pretended to put the commissioners upon proving it, by collating the one with the other memorially. “They produced
“ seven several wrytings wrytten in French, *in*
“ the lyke Romain hand as others her letters, which
“ were shewed yesternight, and avowed by them
“ to be wrytten by the said Quene.” This is such a capital stroke of assurance, as was worthy of Murray, worthy of Elizabeth, and worthy of that complication of all villainies, the forgery of the letters against Mary. It can only be paralleled

leled in all the braveries of human impudence, I believe, by the grand change in the language of the letters. And it forms a very important addition, to what we have seen of that already.

Five only of the ten, however, were yet delivered. The letters from Linlithgow and Kirk-a-field, were resolved to be finally suppressed. And, as to the other three, they were delivered a few days afterward with the journal. This being the scale, by which all the ten were originally graduated; it was very properly presented with the delivered eight of them. But Murray strangely forgot, when he determined to withhold the two others, that were equally graduated by it, and therefore equally mentioned in it; to strike out the mention of what he had withheld. The journal was thus left, referring to a couple of Mary's letters that do not appear at all. He forgot also to alter the journal, in the route by Kalendar and Linlithgow; and make it conformable to the letters. The letters therefore carry the King one way, while the journal conveys him another. And the journal and the letters thus stand, betraying the forgery of themselves and of each other, in the plainest manner.

But that amazing miracle of impudence, in showing the same letters one day in Scotch and the next in French, and pretending them to be different in themselves, and both in Mary's handwriting; accounts very well by itself for the conduct of Murray, in not entrusting the commissioners at Westminster with even *copies* of the *ten*, though he did with copies of the eight. *Those*
were

were professedly adduced as proofs against Mary, equally with *these*. “As they had yesternight produced and shewed sundry writings, tending to *prove* the hatred,” &c. says Murray; “so, for the *further* satisfaction both of the Quene’s Majestie and theyr lordships, they were ready to produce and shew a great number of other letters,” &c. Yet *these* alone staid with the commissioners, even in copies. *Those* were instantly withdrawn, both in copies and in originals. And what seems plainly to intimate, that the commissioners were privy to the whole system of illusion, in secretary Cecil at least, who altered and interlined the journal, as he pleased, and must therefore be supposed to have directed the clerks too, as he thought proper; the journal of the day before, takes no notice of those letters being either produced or withdrawn. But, had they *not* been withdrawn, in what a happy state would the epistolary evidence against Mary have then stood. There would have been *sundry* letters in SCOTCH, pretending to be her handwriting. There would have been *several* of them also in FRENCH, equally pretending to be her writing too. They were both the same. Yet one asserted, she had written them in SCOTCH. The other affirmed, she had written them in FRENCH. Each in effect called the other an impostor. Each proved the other to be so. And both must have fallen a sacrifice, to each other’s pretensions.

But there are two important particulars still behind, which I meant to reach by this novel concatenation of circumstances. They relate to the

the three letters, that were presented to the commissioners at Westminster, posteriorly to the others. And they concern the publication of all the letters in Scotch, afterwards.

Those three appear at present, to stand distinguished from all the rest of the eight, in the nature of their original language. Seeming *not* a part of the series, exhibited to the Scotch council and parliament; *not* a part of that shown to the commissioners at York; and *not* a part of that presented on the 8th of December at Westminster; they look, as if they had been posteriorly fabricated for the purpose. Framed therefore *after* the resolution was finally taken for a French copy, they would naturally be composed in French. And all that has been said, concerning the Scotch being the original and the French a translation; would be totally inapplicable to them. They would be French in their original; and the Scotch, in which they have been published as well as in French, would be considered as a translation from it. This indeed could not affect the force of the argument before, concerning the forgery. The variation in the language, that master-stroke of daring ingenuity, would still demonstrate the spuriousness of the whole for ever. Yet the observable difference, between these and the rest of the French letters at Westminster, must create a difficulty; that ought to be noticed by me in fairness, and should be removed by me (if I can remove it) in judiciousness. And I can do it. What I have already said, does it effectually. When the rebels produced only six of their ten letters,

letters, at York; they did it on the same principle, on which we have seen them so frequently acting before. They were ever fluttering and unsteady in their conduct, unsteady from the eternal instability of guilt, and fluttering from the lively impotence of fear. They were so at Westminster, as well as at York. They kept back at Westminster one of those very letters, which they had antecedently presented at York. They kept back the murderous letter from Kirk-a-field. This had been exhibited at York, even when its companion from Linlithgow had been withheld. Both were now withheld by them, at Westminster. They also produced not three others of the letters. They either suppressed, what they had originally fabricated; or they withheld, what were not yet in existence. They had either not resolved to create any more letters *then*, or they had resolved to condemn these to silence and obscurity in the coffer, for ever. They appeared with this resolution, at York. They even persisted in it on the 8th of December, at Westminster. But at last, and indeed within a few days afterward, even this resolution melted away, in the heat of an agitated conscience. They trod back their steps at Westminster. They trod back their steps at York. They now considered the three letters, as important. They now thought their importance, a full compensation for the contradictoriness, in which they would involve them, and for the detection, to which they would expose them. They therefore took them out of the coffer again, or they sat down to fabricate them. They then had them

translated, like the rest, into French. And they added copies of them, to the copies of the others in Cecil's possession, without even *any previous exhibition of the originals to the commissioners*; and therefore without any mention of either the originals or the copies, in the journal of the commission.

This finishes the curious and striking picture of guilt, in the rebels. This also completes the number of their letters, in French. But how came all these *French* letters, to be published in *Scotch* afterwards? How came they particularly to be published, in that very *Scotch*, in which five of them had been presented at York, and from which all of them had been translated into French, for the commissioners at Westminster? These commissioners had them in *French*, not in *Scotch*. The York commissioners, indeed, had them in *Scotch*. But then they had no copies, as the others had. They had only extracts. And copies cannot be published from extracts. How then came Cecil by the *Scotch* copy, which I have formerly stated him to have published; and a copy exactly the same, as that which was exhibited at York? This is a considerable difficulty. And, as I wish to clear the controversy from every difficulty, I have noticed in order to remove it.

When the rebels presented their eight letters in French at Westminster, they equally presented what they called TRANSLATIONS, with them. They produced in fact their *Scotch* originals with them. And they left these, equally with the pretended originals, in the possession of Cecil and
the

the commissioners. This seems extraordinary. But it was necessary in itself, and it is evident in fact. The publication of the Scotch, as well as the French, points very strongly at such an incident. The natural ignorance of French among the statesmen of those days, made it absolutely requisite. And the journal of the commissioners proves the reality. When Murray determined finally upon a French copy; he must have seen the necessity, for an accompanying translation. The French language was better understood in Scotland than in England, I believe, at this period. The intercourse between the countries, was much greater. The amity between them, was very much greater. Yet the privy counsellors of Scotland would have thought it strange, I believe, to have had French letters laid before them without a translation. The privy counsellors of England certainly would. "We find," says a writer, who had ransacked many of the voluminous letters of Elizabeth's reign, "that the statesmen of that country," England, "in those days," those of which I am now speaking, "were at a loss upon occasions, when they had use for writing papers under hand in the French language." And as he says afterwards, with respect to one of these very commissioners at Westminster, even to the principal of them, and secretary Cecil himself: "whereas the management of that business," the translating these very letters into French, "hath been charged upon secretary Cecil; it is not thereby meant, that he did the drudgery part of the work himself: for

“there are some reasons to be collected from papers yet extant, which will show, that he was not by himself altogether sufficient for it*.” For this reason, Murray was obliged to put in a pretended translation, with his pretended originals. He had one ready for his purpose, in the real originals. This indeed would be Scotch. But then it was to be a translation produced by Scotchmen. It would therefore be as proper for translation, when he had procured it to be copied by a common hand; as it had been for an original, when it was in a hand imitative of Mary’s. And we actually see the commissioners, provided with a translation accordingly.

The five letters were presented in French, on the 8th of December. In the journal of that day, not a hint is given of a translation; any more than in the journal preceding, is a hint of the ten letters, then produced in Scotch to the commissioners. The latter fact indeed appears, from the journal of the day afterward, to have happened on the preceding. Just so it is with the translation. From the journal of the subsequent day, we see the commissioners to have been furnished with a translation, the day before. “The Queen’s Majesty’s commissioners,” says the journal of December the 9th, “being occupied in perusing and reading certain lettres and sonnets wrytten in French, BEING DULY TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH, and other wrytings also,” the two contracts, &c. “exhibited yesterday to them by

* Digges’s Ambassador, 1461, Goodall, i. 113, 114.

“ the Erle of Murray and his colleagues,” &c *.
 This appears to have been in the morning, as
 “ the commissioners proceded untill dinner-tyme,
 “ in the hearing and perusing of the foresaid wryt-
 “ ings;” then went to dinner, returned, and
 met Mary’s commissioners at *one* †. In the
 morning after the exhibition of the letters and
 sonnets, the commissioners appear perusing them;
 and perusing them in the translation, as they
 testify themselves. And this translation appears
 also, from their own attestation, to have been
 equally with the letters, sonnets, and other writ-
 ings, “ exhibited yesterday to them by the Erle
 “ of Murray and his colleagues.”

In this manner came the commissioners to be
 furnished, with a pretended translation of the
 French letters into Scotch, and with a real trans-
 lation of the French verses into Scotch prose. In
 this manner also, came Cecil to be in possession of
 both. The three posteriour letters would be pre-
 sented, like the former five and the sonnets, with
 their Scotch versions attending upon them. And
 thus were two successive agents of Cecil’s enabled
 to publish the sonnets and the letters, in Scotch
 and in French progressively.

The Scotch was published, from the same of-
 fice with the French. It therefore pretended to
 be, what Murray had presented it for, a translation
 only from the French. It also carried for the
 same reason, at the head of every letter, a few
 clauses of that very French copy, which was yet

* Appendix, No. viii.

† Ibid. *ibid.*

unpublished, and yet deposited in the office of Cecil. And the eighth letter in French having perished by some accident, posteriorly to the publication of the Scotch; Cecil's agent could not publish any more of it in French, than what had been thus preserved by the Scotch copy. From Cecil's office came both. But so little stress did Cecil or Elizabeth lay upon the copies, either in French or in Scotch, which Murray had left with the commissioners; that Cecil seems to have sent *those very copies, to the press*. He and she must undoubtedly have valued neither, except only as implements of mischief, to be set at work against Mary. By publishing them, they were setting them at work in a most formidable manner. They were doing in effect against Mary, what Murray's associates had done in fact against Darnly before, and what some papists attempted to do afterwards against the son of both. They were digging a mine, in order to blow her and all her fortunes into the air at once. For such a purpose, they could not scruple to send Murray's copies, and their originals, to the press at once. From them was the Scotch printed, I apprehend: Murray's copy of the Scotch equally pretending with the published Scotch, to be a translation; and therefore, in all probability, carrying equally some clauses of the French, at the head of each of its letters. From them also, I believe, was the French copy printed, with the loss only of the eighth letter; which had perished in some fire, or other calamity, at the press; and which, as it could be retrieved in a small part only, from the Scotch

2

copy

copy published before, was therefore not published at all. In consequence of the whole, both the Scotch and the French copies, which were originally deposited with Cecil, and with Cecil remained for months afterwards, *have disappeared from among his papers*. Though a variety of writings, which were just as much detached and single papers, which were much less than these in bulk, and were greatly less in value, are still to be seen in his collection; yet these are gone. *Those* were never published. *Those* were never sent to the press. But *these* were. One of these actually perished, antecedently to the printing. All perished at it. And the Scotch, and the French, have equally shared in the incidental destruction*.

* Goodall, ii. 73, 74, 75, 76, and 76—84, for papers which were equally copies with these.

THE
CONCLUSION
TO THE
FIRST VOLUME.

I HAVE thus gone over all the arguments in proof of the forgery, which I intended to lay before my reader in this volume. They are all FACTS. They are all very important facts, in the history of the letters, contracts, and sonnets. They carry their own power of conviction, with them. They speak with energy to every mind. And they go with an irresistible decisiveness, I think, to the very heart and center of the cause.

I began with the conduct of Elizabeth and Murray, as acting in confederacy together. This was so well known in some of its parts, and stood forth to the eye so prominent in all; that it arrested my attention first, and was therefore the best calculated to fasten first on my reader's. In the detail of this conduct, regularly as I have authenticated it, not merely by reference to the proving passages, but by an actual production of the passages themselves; we have seen Murray
and

and Elizabeth, behaving in a most dishonourable manner. Elizabeth particularly appears in a light, that must shock her numerous admirers greatly. Yet *fiat justitia, ruat cælum*. The low adulations of her own age, and the consenting flatteries of succeeding times, have united to throw a blaze of glory, around the head of this political saint; to which she has as little claim, as many of the religious saints in the calendar of Rome to theirs. I admire her abilities. But I despise her principles. I admire her sagacity of understanding, her comprehensiveness of policy, and her vigour of resolution. But I detest her habits of swearing, her habits of hypocrisy, her rancorous jealousy, and her murderous malignity. Elizabeth indeed appears in her worst light, while she is seen in her transactions with Mary. On this worst part of her history, have I been obliged to dwell. Nor should I have done justice to an injured Queen, if I had not stated this part of the history in its full glare of enormity before the eye. The generality of mankind are undignified enough in their own spirit, to pay their respect to understanding, at the expence of morality; to ennoble persons, who are only great from their powers, their situations, and their success; and to sink from view the profligacy, with which those powers were exerted, these situations were improved, and this success was insured. But let not such, as aspire to lead the opinions of the publick, be content to practise the vice of the vulgar. The interests of VIRTUE, should

should be the object of every writer. And one single grain of virtue, it should be for ever considered, is worth more in the estimate of reason and of God; than all the mass of intellect, that is diffused through the universe.

But having with the just severity of truth, I trust, laid open the behaviour of Elizabeth and Murray, during the conferences in England; I then proceeded to show the grounds and causes of all this, in the wretched state of the forgeries themselves. I have shown the letters peculiarly, that main substance of all the forgeries, to have been changed and altered in a most wonderful manner. Throgmorton, who had received an account of the first letters from the very formers of them, could not possibly have recognized them again in the last. Like the ship of Athens, or the stockings of Sir John Cutler, they had scarcely one particle of their original materials left behind. Yet, like those stockings and that ship, they pretended to be still the same. And, what was infinitely more, they pretended to be the un-darned, the un-repaired same, from the very beginning.

The letters of Throgmorton's days, I have shown to have been merely ideal at the time, though they were realized afterwards. But a new set was soon formed upon a new principle. Even this was superseded afterwards. A new principle again took possession of the mind. And a new set again appeared upon the stage. The murder was the object of the FIRST. The adultery had no share in it. The adultery and the murder became

became joint objects of the SECOND. The murder was still principal, but the adultery showed itself of nearly equal magnitude with it. And at last, in the THIRD, the adultery became principal, and the murder was only hinted at.

Both the second and the third I have also shown, to have undergone many alterations of another nature. They appeared SUBSCRIBED by Mary, on the 4th of December 1567; they appeared NOT subscribed, on the 15th—29th of the same month. They were SUPERSCRIBED to Bothwell originally; yet they appeared NOT superscribed afterwards. They were all DATED, both in time and place, BEFORE and DURING their appearance at York; but NOT after it. They were also DIVERS in number, and SIX probably, with the parliament of Scotland, the first and second, which are from Glasgow, two from Kirk-a-field and Linlithgow, and the fifth and sixth, which are from Stirling. They were certainly SIX at York; the first, second, and *third*, which are from Glasgow, one from Kirk-a-field, and the fifth and sixth, which are from Stirling. They were only FIVE at Westminster, on the 8th of December; the three from Glasgow, and the two from Stirling. They were SUNDRY at Westminster, on the 7th of December, and probably SEVEN; the letters of the 8th, and the two from Linlithgow and Kirk-a-field, united together. They were afterwards THREE MORE; the fourth, the seventh, and the eighth. And they were even, by an union of all, and by a reduplication of
of

of some, EIGHTEEN in the months of December and January, 1569, and on the 22d of January 1571.*.

Nor is this all. The evidence against Mary, was merely the LETTERS at first. For nearly fifteen months from the asserted seizure of Mary's casket, it had disclosed nothing but letters against her. But, being properly put to the torture, it gave up twelve SONNETS and two CONTRACTS of marriage, to impeach her reputation. And then these pretended, to have been equally found with the letters at first.

But what is most astonishing, amid all these successive scenes of astonishment, is the change of the LANGUAGE in the letters. They appeared as SCOTCH before the council and the parliament of Scotland, in December 1567. Yet Murray asserted them to be in FRENCH, by a message to Elizabeth in June following. But they still appeared in SCOTCH to the commissioners at York, in the ensuing month of October. And, after all, they re-appeared in FRENCH to the very same commissioners, only a few weeks afterward at Westminster. What is even more surprising, they appeared some of them in French and some in Scotch, and both pretending equally to be Mary's writing.

All these variations sufficiently vindicate the conduct of Elizabeth and of Murray, for the POLICY, though not for the PROBITY, of it; in the tricks and stratagems, in the frauds and evasions,

* Appendix, No. iv. Morton's Receipt.

which we have seen this couple of political jugglers exhibiting before. They both knew of the forgery. They both knew of these striking signatures of it. They both knew particularly, of the changes and re-changes in the language of the letters. And their knowledge will combine with their conduct, I fear, to speak in a bolder style against them both, than any which I have used.

But, whatever is the fate of these, the innocence of Mary must now be admitted by all, I think. The witnesses against her have been tried in the examination of the letters, sonnets, and contracts. One single variation in their testimony, must have been fatal to the whole. But I have found many.

Each of these, in my opinion, forms a strong and lively ray of light, to disclose the forgery to every eye. The last of them, I think, forms a ray exceedingly lively and strong. And all together they unite into such a powerful blaze, I apprehend; as lays open the whole forgery from end to end, as enables the most weak-eyed to see, and compels the most incredulous to believe.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

I N D E X

T O

V O L. I.

A.

ANDERSON—Blamed, 143.
ATHOL (Earl of)—His treacherous conduct to Mary, 323—324.

B.

BALFOUR (Sir James)—His character, 233—234. His asserted conduct concerning the letters, refuted, 233—239. Some curious and valuable pieces of plate, said to be given him by Mary, probably plundered by him from her palace, 238.

BEATON } Mary—originally supposed the forger of the letters,
BETHUNE } 348.

BILL—Used in Scotch to signify a long writing, 493—494.

BOLTON (Mary's prison in England)—where, 154.

BOTHWELL (the famous Earl of)—Could not, as asserted by the rebels, have sent for the letters, 229—245. Why he went to the north, 240—241. When, 241—245. How inconsistent the rebels are in their account of his guilt, 289—294. When his servants were first seized, 294—297. His own trial before, why and by whom managed as it was, 302—304. The new title conferred on him by Mary, at his marriage to her, 240. He went away from Carberrie-hill at the instance of the rebels, 275—276.

BUCHANAN—His Detection characterized, 11. Supported by Elizabeth, 11. When first published in Latin, in English, 191—193. Which of the letters were subjoined to the Latin, 193. Which, &c. to the English, 193—194. All were meant to have been subjoined to the Latin, 533. The French Detection how erroneous, and why, 540—544. A falshood in his History, 222. A suppression in it, 115. He did not forge the letters, 348. His general character, 528.

C.

CAMUZ—Employed by whom in translating the letters out of Scotch into French, 529—530 and 531—536. He translated all of them, 536—539.

I N D E X.

- CARY** (Earl of Monmouth)—His curious account of Elizabeth's death, 46—49.
- CECIL**—The great agent of Elizabeth against Mary, 106. His scandalous conduct towards Mary, 105—106, 115—118, 138—139, 152, 191—197, 431—432, 474—475, 515, 532, and 559. He accepted some of Mary's stolen jewels from Murray, at the conference in England, 215—216. A falsehood in his letters, 277—278; serving to expose another falsehood in the rebels, 277—278.
- CHALLENGE**—From Dr. Stuart to Dr. Robertson, to defend what he had written against Mary, vi—vii. From the present author to any writer of consequence, to maintain the guilt of Mary, xvii—xix.
- COCKBURN** (Sir John)—See **SKIRLING**.
- COFFER** (containing the letters, &c.)—What, 207—210. Only one, according to the rebels, 205—209. Yet two also, according to them, 209—211. Whence had by them, 212—216. Actually produced and shown in England, 474—475.
- CONFERENCE** (in England concerning Mary)—How conducted at York, 70—83. Who were Elizabeth's commissioners there, 76. Their respective characters, 76. Which of them was acting probably in a private concert with Elizabeth, 76—77. The secret reason for holding this conference at York, 77—78; for breaking it off, 79—83; and for transferring it to Westminster, 83. How conducted at Westminster, 83—171. Who were Elizabeth's commissioners there, 83. Their characters in general, 103—104.
- CONTRACTS** (of marriage, pretendedly Mary's)—When pretended to be discovered, and when first mentioned, 426—429. Formed for what, 429 and 443—444. Founded on what, 429. Which of them is still existing in the original, 430—431. This plainly not written and subscribed by Mary, 431. Written in what hand and subscribed in what, 431. Yet written and subscribed in the same hand, when shown at York, 431—432. Why in French, 501. The production of either against Mary, unknown to her or her embassadour, 432—433.
- CONTROVERSY**—Cannot be managed without some sharpness, xv. This concerning Mary peculiarly cannot, xv—xvi. And some keenness is requisite to rouse the publick from its long dream of slander against her, xvi—xvii.
- CROWN OF THE SUN**—A Scotch coin, 253 and 254. A French one, 253—254. Of what value, 254.

D.

- DALGLEISH**—When said to be taken with the letters, &c. 205—209. When really taken and without the letters, 245—297.
- DARNLY** (Lord)—A painting of the time representing what concerning

I N D E X.

cerning him, where, and how, 230. A mistake in the inscription upon it, 230. And a view of the armies at Carberrie-hill upon it, 230—231. The grand æra of discovery concerning his murder, 293—295.

DATES—Of records in Mary's days frequently anticipated in time and place, 421.

DAVISON (secretary to Elizabeth)—A general account of his Apology, for his share in the murder of Mary, xiv. A description of Elizabeth's movements towards the murder from it, 176—189.

E.

EDINBUROUGH—Why called Lisleburgh by the French, 553.

ELIZABETH (Queen of England)—Superiour to Mary in what, 36. Inferiour in what, 36. An unbeliever, 37. Her sacrilegious spirit, 37. Her licentious life, 37. Her insidious politicks, 37. Her constant designs upon the peace of other nations, 37—38. These designs played back upon England afterwards, 38—39. Her special grounds of ill-will to Mary, 39—40. Her hatred of her successor as such, 40—41. Her strange law concerning her natural issue, 41—42. Her dying without appointing a successor, 41—43. Her ambition to triumph over Mary in beauty and dress, 43. Her horrible conduct in general to Mary, 43—45. Her killing herself in a sullen melancholy, how, and why, 45—47.

———— Her general intrigues against Mary in Scotland, 47. Her driving Mary by them out of Scotland into England, 47. Her behaviour to Mary then, 47—49.

———— Her insisting that Murray should accuse Mary, 54—56. Yet pretending she does not insist, 56—57. Pretending to Mary she will restore her, 57—60. So inducing Mary to hold a conference with her rebels, 58. Assuring Murray she will not restore Mary, if proved guilty, 60—66. So inducing him to accuse her, 62, 63, and 65. Yet pretending she meant not to allow any accusation of her, 57 and 61. Her political intrigues with Murray before, 69—70. Her lamentation on his death, 70. Her conduct to Mary through the conference, 70—165. Her pronouncing Mary innocent at the close, 168—170. Her full conviction of Mary's innocence, 96—97, 146, and 202. Yet not restoring her, 170. Even keeping her more strictly in prison, 170—171. Even assisting her rebels with money, 170. And even at last murdering her, 171.

———— Her distant advances towards the murder, 171—175. Her immediate advances for seven days together, 176—189.

———— Her publishing the letters, &c. after she had pronounced Mary innocent, 189—198. Her design to get Mary's

I N D E X.

son into her hand, 264—265. Her attempt to poison him, 265. Her acting always in concert with Mary's rebels, 47, 261—264, and 269.

ELIZABETH—Her indirectly inviting Murray to give her some of Mary's jewels, 215—216. Her accepting some of them from him, 215. And accepting them at the conference, 216. Her ministers accepting some too, at the same time, 215—216. The general profligacy of her ministers and embassadors, 266—268. Her bold habit of lying, 90—93, 93—94, 95—96, 118, 122—123. Her low cunning, 72, 73, 78, 97, 101. Her duplicity on a particular occasion, 262—263. And her whole conduct in this volume summed up, 570.

F.

FORGERY (besides that of the letters, sonnets, and contracts)—See 330 and 482.

G.

GOODALL (Mr. Walter)—His work in favour of Mary characterized, iii—iv. Its reception in the world, iv—vi. He suggested the poor subterfuge taken up by his enemies since, 517. Mistakes in him, 55, 98, 163, 421, and 540—544. Useful notices in him, 399, 493—494, 515, 518, and 542.

GRANGE (Sir Wm. Kirkaldy of)—His treachery to Mary, 324—327.

H.

HAILES (Sir D. Dalrymple, Lord)—Was expected to oppose the present work, ix—x. Writes to the author, xiii. And declines the contest, xvii.

HUME (Mr.)—His opposition to Mr. Goodall, iv—v. His reply to Mr. Tytler, v. His silence to Mr. Tytler's answer, v. He more bigotted to Elizabeth's schemes, than Elizabeth herself, 94. Censured, 143, 151, 231, 383—384, 433—443, and 515—523. Praised, 365 and 421.

HUNTLY (Earl of)—A witness to one of the contracts, how, 432—443. His and Argyle's protestation of Murray's guilt, 433—436.

I.

JOURNAL (made by the rebels)—Drawn up for the formation of the letters, 411. Where found, 411—412. Its account of the dates to the letters, 412—414. It was not drawn up at the time, but when, 416—418. Afterwards enlarged, and when, 418—419. Its absurdities and falsehoods, 461—462, 462—465, 558, and 559.

KNOX

I N D E X.

K.

KNOX (John)—His wild preaching against Mary, 307 and 311—312. His character of Elizabeth, 37. An anecdote of his in honour of Mary, 27. A gross mis-print in his history, 254.

L.

LESLEY (Bishop of Ross)—His defence of Mary characterized, i—ii. Suppressed by Elizabeth, ii. His memorial to Elizabeth, 402—403, 408, 415, and 416. His general conduct, 441.

LETHINGTON (Wm. Maitland the younger of)—His account of Mary in 1562, 30—31, and 32. His treachery to Mary, 323—327. He owns he had frequently forged Mary's writing, 108. Put Throgmorton probably upon his act of treachery to Mary, 331 and 349—350. Probably forged the letters, 348—350, and 528. Yet was fully convinced that Mary was not guilty, 108 and 278. Suggests the murder of Rizzio, 358. Suggests the marriage of Mary with Norfolk, 358. Called by whom the father of all mischief, 358. His character, 528. The letters, forged by him, carry much vulgarity and meanness in them, 374—376. He was probably concerned in the murder of Darnly, 433.

LETTERS (ascribed to Mary)—Shown clandestinely to Elizabeth's commissioners at York, why and how, 70—78. Shown also to Elizabeth, when, 77. Again shown to Elizabeth, when, 78. Yet she pretended afterwards to know nothing about them, 91—92. Shown again to her commissioners at Westminster, 101—102. Compared by them with what, 102—104. Shown again to her privy-council, 119. Compared by them with what, 119—120. These un-examined and un-attested, 120—122. Whence these were fetched probably, 122—129.

The originals of Mary's letters shown and withdrawn, at York and Westminster, 129—131, and 131—132. Only copies left at Westminster, 129—130. Mary precluded from seeing the originals, 132—136. Precluded equally from having copies, 136—138. A trick of Elizabeth's to preclude Mary from seeing the originals, 138—144. A request for copies from Mary, first evaded and then denied, 144—151. Elizabeth had previously promised Mary a copy, if she would answer to the charge founded on the letters, 151—153. Mary, not knowing this, calls for a copy, 154—155. Then Elizabeth delays to give her one, 155—156. Mary again calls for a copy, 156—157. Yet Elizabeth still delays, 157—158. And the letters are sent away without any copy being given, 158.

I N D E X.

LETTERS—The opinion of the English nation concerning them, at the close of all, 199—202. When, and by whom, and for what end, the letters were first published, 189—198.

The asserted discovery of the letters, disproved in its circumstances, 205—245. Disproved equally in its essence, 245—318. When and how the letters were first mentioned, 319—320. Yet not in being then, 320—322. Then talked of, and afterwards made, only to do what, 322, 344—347, 350, and 405. Who forged them probably, 348—350 and 358. When, 358 and 417—418. The contradictory accounts of discovering them, given by the rebels, 361—363.

A variation in the general substance of the letters, concerning the murder, 363—361. Why, and how far, 368—371. In their particular substance, concerning the adultery, 371—374. And how far, 374—376.

A variation in the subscriptions, 376—399. The letters passed through the parliament and council of Scotland, as proofs of what charge, 378—380. By what means passed through the parliament, 380—381. Actually shown to the parliament and council, 381—382. Who was clerk of the council then, 392. Who clerk of the parliament, 393.

A variation in the directions, 400—409. The first letter not addressed to Bothwell originally, 402. No conveyance of any letters to Bothwell, ever attempted to be proved, 407—408. The friends of Mary in parliament, precluded from taking advantage of this and the preceding variation, how, 404—406. How they acted under them, 407. How the commissioners in England acted under this, 408—409.

A variation in the dates, 410—421. The letters all known by Murray to be dated originally, 410—411. A journal drawn up for dating them, 411—412. All dated, when shown at York, 412—415. All except one un-dated, when shown at Westminster, 415—416. Why those un-dated, 416—420. Why this still dated, 420—421.

A variation in the number, 446—480. How many, when shown to the parliament and council of Scotland, 446, 556, and 572. How many, when shown at York, 446—447. How many at Westminster, when first shown, 447—448. How many at Westminster, when shown afterwards, 448—450. Other letters also, just appearing, 450—458. Why only just appearing, 458—459. The number of these, 459—462. These similar to those, 462—465. Which of those were shown at York, 465—468, 556—558, and 572. Which were added afterwards, 468—469, and 560—562. A grand change made in the letters, 454—456. A grand variation in them from the journal, 462—465. In letter first a grand misnomer, 454—455. In letter seventh a gross anachronism, 470—473. In letters fourth, seventh, and eighth, gross absurdity,

I N D E X.

- furdity, 476—479. All occasioned by multiplying and altering the letters, 474—476 and 476—480.
- LETTERS—A variation in the language, 481—515. They were Scotch, till when, 486—509. Extracts from the Scotch as then exhibited, 503—507. Resolved to be put into French, when, 494—498. When actually put, 510—511. By whom put, 528—532. How he translated them, 532—534. His own acknowledgment of the fact, 534—539.
- These letters, proved before to be similar to, now shown to be the same with, those, 544—549. Yet different, how, 549—560. The very same letters produced to the English commissioners, one day in Scotch, and another in French, 557—559. And how all came to be published in Scotch, as well as in French, 562—567.
- Neither Mary nor her embassadour could get a copy of them, before they were published, 480—482. The French copy of the eighth letter, why not published, 531 and 566—567. And the first copies of all, French and Scotch, where now, 566—567.
- LIBERTY—Most clamoured for when least endangered, 353.
- LANDSAY (Lord)—His conduct to Mary, 271—272 and 337—339.
- LOCH-LEVIN (Mary's prison in Scotland)—Described, 339—340. Mary escaped out of it, just when, 53. The lord of it, one of her keepers, 271—272. His conduct to Mary, 272. His mother, a whore to Mary's father, her principal keeper, 48. Her conduct to Mary, 48. Mary's real attendants there, 272. Mary's conduct there vindicated, 272—278. Mary compelled there to resign her crown, how, 337—339.

M.

- MAR (Lord)—His treachery to Mary, 323—327.
- MARY (Queen)—The evidence alleged principally against her, what, i. The history of its reception in the world, i—vii. Her general character, as attested by the English, the Italians, and her own rebels, 24—29. The civil and religious causes that conspired to ruin her, 21—50. Her over-generous credulity, 51—54. Her moderation towards the protestant part of her subjects, 30—31 and 32. The want of this in the protestants towards her, 30. The protestant clergy particularly violent, 31—32. Not to be kept in any bounds, 32. And only tools in the hand of her bastard brother, 35.
- The rape committed on Mary by Bothwell, 25 and 429. The honourable sorrow of Mary on the violent death of her de-throner, 54.
- Mary's condition when she fled into England, 47—49. How treated immediately, 49; though invited into England by Elizabeth

I N D E X.

- Elizabeth herself, 50—51. How treated afterwards in general, 50.
- Mary drawn into a conference with her rebels, how, 54—67. The history of this conference at York, 70—83; at Westminster, 83—171. Mary's demand to come and answer a charge, how, 93. Elizabeth owns the demand very reasonable, 94. But puts it off at first, and then refuses it, 93 and 94—95. Mary is never heard at all, 95—96. Is debarred from all sight of the letters, and all copies, 132—138, 141—144, and 144—151. Her heroical refusal to purchase acquittal by resignation, 138—141. Not Mary, but Elizabeth, puts an end to the conference, 159—165. Mary's innocence at the close pronounced by Elizabeth, 168—170; and believed by the English nation, 199—202.
- The gradual steps towards the murder of Mary, 171—189. The letters published to blast her character, 189—198. Her side-board of plate melted down by her rebels, 215. Her jewels given and sold by them, 215—216. The rich furniture of her palace, 215.
- Mary's conduct in her Scotch prison vindicated, 272—278. At Carberrie-hill, &c. before, 275—277. The charge against her from the letters, first made before the letters were said at the time to be found, 284—289, 299—300, 304—305, 307—309, 311—313. When the points in the charge were first mentioned, 284—285, 297, 314, 315—316. Mary was plainly averred immediately afterwards, to be innocent, 301, 303—305, 305—306, 309—310. But her dethronement intended before and executed now, 269—270 and 311—313. How executed, 313—316, 320—341. Who signed the warrant for her imprisonment, 326. The fewness of the chiefs against her, 332—334. Encouraged by her clemency, 334—335.
- The inconsistent assertions of the rebels concerning her dethronement, whether voluntary or not, 341 and 342—344. Their perjuries and forgeries to prove it voluntary, 341 and 351. Their assertions of it not being voluntary, 342 and 344. And their wanting a real resignation after all, 344—348.
- Mary's innocence fully asserted by the rebels, 303—306 and 310. Her general conduct indirectly owned by them to be irreproachable, 352—357. The quick sensitiveness of honour in Mary, 283—284. And the real reverence of her rebels for her virtues, 301—302, 309, 310.
- The violence done to Mary by Bothwell in the marriage, 303—305. The rebels assert the probability of his poisoning her after the marriage, 304—305. Mary's life determined to be taken from her by her rebels, if her friends did what, 380—381 and 404—406.
- The evidences against her, varying in their substance, subscriptions,

I N D E X.

- tions, directions, dates, number, and language, 363—567.
 No other evidences but the letters known to Mary or her embassadour, 440—443, 480—482.
- The friends of Mary not followed by the present author, 329, 348, 365, 382, 421, 434, 469—472, 474, 501—502.
- MELVILL (Sir Robert)—His treachery to Mary, 261—262. His double dealing between her and her rebels, 282—283, 314, 323, and 335—336. His dishonesty to her, 335—336.
- (Sir James)—His duplicity of conduct, 268. Mistakes in his memoirs, 295. Useful notices in them, 295, 324.
- MISCELLANEOUS REMARKER (on the letters)—Animadverted upon, 384—392.
- MORGAN (Mary's agent in France)—Elizabeth offered, what, for his person, 202.
- MORTON (the famous Earl of)—His pretended interception of the letters, 236—238. His standing with Bothwell at Bothwell's trial, 302. His managing the whole cause for Bothwell, 302—304.
- MURRAY (the famous Earl of)—How far a man of abilities, 33. How far a good man, 34. A traitor, how early, 34. Bred up to the church, why, 34—35. What preferments he had in it, 35. He became a statesman, 35. His love of political intrigues, 35—36. His siding with the reformers, 36.
- His infamous proposal to Elizabeth, 67—68. All complied with, 72, 73, 74, 76—77, 78, 81—82, and 130. His intimacy with Elizabeth, 70.
- His showing the letters privately at York, to Elizabeth's commissioners, 70—71. His bribing Elizabeth and Cecil with some of Mary's jewels, 215—216. His hypocritical protestation on his showing the letters publickly at Westminster, 85—89. His managing Elizabeth by her resentments, 83—85. The manner of his exhibiting the charge against Mary, 98—101. That of his producing the letters against her, 101—104 and 129. He and his letters ordered away, why, 142—143. He takes leave, 143. Yet still stays, 143.
- He was probably concerned in the murder of Darnly, 433. Is guilty by his very defence, 436—439. In a plot with Mary's rebels, while in France, 262. His violent death, 54. Mary's generous grief on it, 54. Elizabeth's selfish sorrow, 70.

N.

- NORFOLK (Duke of)—A commissioner from Elizabeth at York, 76. Favourable to Mary, 76 and 108—109. But not till when, 108. Yet brow-beaten by Elizabeth for it, 109. His marriage with Mary first suggested by Elizabeth's very ministers, 358. Probably solemnized, 202—203.

I N D E X.

P.

- PARIS** (a servant of Mary's)—Two pretended confessions of his, where lodged, 469. How lodged there, 469. He was dead before any confessions were pretended to have been made, 468—469. No proof of his being in the rebel hands at the conference, 469—472. When first in those hands, 471.
- PENNANT** (Mr.)—His Travels quoted, praised, and censured, 339—340.
- POISONING**—Attempted by Elizabeth against whom, 265.
- POWRY**—What servant to Bothwell, 294. When taken by the rebels, 294 and 295—296.

R.

- REFORMATION** (in Scotland)—A violent one, 22—23, 30, 31—32, and 36.
- RELIGION**—Generally reported to be most in danger, when least, 353.
- ROBERTSON** (Dr.)—His opposition to Mr. Goodall, iv—v. His retreat before Mr. Tytler, v. His silence to Dr. Stuart, vii. He was expected to have written against the present work, ix. Had published a new edition of his history, what weeks before this was published, xi. Had then for the first time attempted to answer, what, xi—xii. Who was then dead, xi. But he is not disposed, it seems, to engage in the contest, xvii—xviii. His History and Dissertation censured, 74, 108, 143, 278, 283—284, 318—319, 399, 406, 435, 441, 480—482, 515—527, 537—539. Praised, 365, 421, 434, 435, 502.
- RUTHVEN** (Lord)—One of Mary's keepers in her Scotch prison, 271. Removed, because he began to show favour to her, 271.

S.

- SADLER** (Sir Ralph)—His conduct, 72, 74—75, 76—77, 78, 115—118.
- SCOTLAND**—The state of it when Mary arrived from France, 29—30. French not known to all statesmen there, 488—489. Some of the barons, and many of the gentry, not able to write, 489.
- SECRET COUNCIL**—The privy council of Scotland was so called, 249. Mary's rebel lords therefore took the name, 249.
- SKIRLING** (Sir John Cockburn of)—Said by the rebels to have been what, when the letters were lodged in the castle, 226. But the mention of this marks the forgery of the whole, 226—228.
- SONNETS** (ascribed to Mary)—When pretended to have been discovered, 424. When first mentioned at the time, 425. Why forged, 426 and 443—444. Unknown to Mary and her embassadour,

I N D E X.

baſſadour, 440—443. Once forgotten by Murray, 449. The groſſneſs of them, 476. The French of them the original, and the Scotch a tranſlation, 501—502. Why forged in French, 501.

STATESMEN—Think themſelves at liberty to do as ſuch, what, 266—268. Have only one ſet of ideas, 328. Did not all know French, in Scotland, 488—489; in England, 563—564.

STEWARD (Robert)—The aſſaſſin of a French preſident, 262, 264. Thrown into priſon, but eſcaping, 264. And afterwards employed by Cecil, 264.

STUART (Dr.)—His hiſtory of Mary characterized, vi. His challenge of Dr. Robertſon, vi—vii. A miſtake in him, 470. An uſeful notice in him, 246.

T.

THROGMORTON (Sir Nicholas)—Sent embaſſadour by Elizabeth into Scotland in 1567, why, 260—265. His real character as an embaſſadour, 265—268. His diſpatches prove the forgery of the letters, 268—318. His treachery to Mary, 327—332. His previous treachery, 329. His prevarications to Mary and Elizabeth now, 329—331 and 331—332. His full and final conviction concerning Mary's innocence, 201. Dates in three of his letters corrected, 282—283, 289, and 311. His readineſs to liſten to ſlanders againſt Mary, 267—268, 272—278, 283—284.

TULLIBARDIN (Lord of)—His treachery to Mary, 323—325.

TYTLER (Mr.)—His work in favour of Mary characterized, v. and vi. A miſtake in it, 365, 470. An uſeful notice, 54. Another, 175. Another, 199. Another, 384. And another, 399.

E R R A T A.

- P. 32, L. 13, for "chapel" read "channel."
 41, 10, for "her" read "hers."
 — 14, for "Se" read "She."
 45, Note, last line but four, for "iii." read "ii."
 90, L. 22, for "darling" read "daring."
 182, 7, for "she" read "he."
 201, Note †, erase "Appendix, No. xxii. and."
 208, 5, for "xi." read "ii."
 278, Note, L. 10, to "hereafter" add "(Appendix, No. v.)"
 303, Note, 7 from the bottom, for "And finding" read
 " But finding."
 314, L. last but one, for "wound" read "would."
 333, 4, for "Kord" read "Lord."
 491, Note, for "Goodall, ii. 64 and 67" read "Appendix,
 " No. ii."



Whitaker, John, 1735-1808

Mary Queen Of Scots Vindicated In Three Volumes

Bd.: 1

London 1790

Brit. 552-1

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10479020-5